

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Res. 575. Resolution for the improvement of rural delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. Res. 576. Resolution requesting the Secretary of State to investigate the seizure of five fishing vessels of the United States by the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 577. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7764, a bill to authorize the construction of modern naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. Res. 578. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 579. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 580. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. Res. 581. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission to study and report on American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 582. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission on American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. Res. 583. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 584. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 585. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. Res. 586. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, requesting the enactment of legislation for a national and comprehensive pension program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 8328. A bill for the relief of John Clarke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 8329. A bill for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, Sor Elisa Perez Tejeiro, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8330. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, his wife Adela Duran Cue-

vas de Thomasa, and his child Jose Maria Thomasa Duran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8331. A bill for the relief of Ralph Ambrose Thrall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 8332. A bill for the relief of Elena Bohdenecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGUIRE:

H. R. 8333. A bill for the relief of S. Francis Liu and Victor Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 8334. A bill for the relief of Shizu Terauchi Parks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 8335. A bill for the relief of Dr. L. W. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 8336. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Marchetti Belluomini, Mirena Belluomini, and Salvatore Belluomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 8337. A bill for the relief of William A. Hogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

2100. Mr. FORAND presented a resolution of the City Council of Providence, R. I., petitioning the Congress and the President of the United States to enact without delay such legislation as may be needed to continue Federal control of rents until such time as the current housing shortage may be eased, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, high over all, blessed forever, whose dwelling is the light of setting suns, the round ocean, the living air, the blue sky, and in the mind of man, we lift our hearts to Thee. Thou makest Thyself known in the stillness. May we become aware of Thy healing presence in this hallowed moment. Grant us to rise on stepping stones of our dead selves to finer and better things. Nourish within us a divine discontent, that we may be restless among the things that spoil the music of our common humanity. Plant a cross in our hearts and let it burn out all vanity and pride. Set us apart to be builders of a better world, architects of nobler international relationships.

Thou hast shown us, O Lord, what is good. Enable us to perform what Thou dost require, to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, our God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Jour-

nal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 2, 1950, was dispensed with.

NOTICE OF VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, tomorrow the Prime Minister of Pakistan and a party of 10 will arrive at the Capitol around noon. They will be escorted to the Vice President's office, and later the Prime Minister will appear before the Senate to address the Members thereof. I make the announcement now in the hope that all Senators will be present at the time the Prime Minister appears, which, I repeat, will be 12 o'clock.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAPEHART was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning today and continuing for 1 week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HICKENLOOPER was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. McCLELLAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to conduct a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING DISLOYALTY CHARGES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the subcommittee investigating disloyalty charges in the State Department is now accumulating quite a number of witnesses. I have been tied up in the mornings, the afternoons, and some evenings in the hearings. The witnesses are becoming restive because we cannot place them on the stand promptly, and in many cases they have to be here a week at a time before we can call them.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that we are going into some phases of the matter which have not been currently heard by the committee, I shall have to ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be allowed to sit at such times as necessary during the sessions of the Senate in order to dispose of these witnesses. We have accumulated such a backlog of work that unless we are given this right, we could not possibly hear and determine the issues which are involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hoey	Maybank
Anderson	Holland	Millikin
Benton	Humphrey	Mundt
Brewster	Hunt	Myers
Bricker	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	O'Connor
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Cordon	Kefauver	Russell
Darby	Kem	Saltonstall
Donnell	Kerr	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Eaton	Leahy	Taft
Ellender	Lehman	Taylor
Ferguson	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Tobey
Fulbright	McClellan	Tydings
George	McFarland	Wherry
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Gurney	McMahon	Williams
Hayden	Magnuson	Young
Hendrickson	Malone	
Hickenlooper	Martin	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 794) for the relief of certain contractors employed

in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett;

H. R. 1814. An act for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz;

H. R. 2464. An act for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll;

H. R. 3169. An act granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3305. An act for the relief of the estate of Jose Salgado Santos;

H. R. 3675. An act for the relief of Erik H. Lindman;

H. R. 3994. An act for the relief of John D. Lange;

H. R. 4011. An act for the relief of Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos or Matheou);

H. R. 4163. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Dr. Ferdinando Schiappa;

H. R. 4371. An act for the relief of Shiro Takemura;

H. R. 4623. An act for the relief of John G. Essenberg;

H. R. 4806. An act for the relief of Dr. Francesco Drago;

H. R. 5051. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria;

H. R. 5150. An act for the relief of Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal;

H. R. 5151. An act for the relief of the estate of Louridine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas;

H. R. 5250. An act for the relief of J. L. Smelcer;

H. R. 5639. An act for the relief of Ivan E. Townsend;

H. R. 5972. An act for the relief of Ivar G. Johnson;

H. R. 6053. An act for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.;

H. R. 6169. An act for the relief of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe;

H. R. 6198. An act for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 6449. An act for the relief of Mrs. L. M. Cox and Mrs. M. R. Nickle;

H. R. 6489. An act for the relief of United Transformer Co. (formerly United Transformer Corp.);

H. R. 6505. An act to legalize the entry of Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Toie), a native of New Zealand;

H. R. 6652. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Ralph E. Brown;

H. R. 7050. An act for the relief of Louise Gam Year;

H. R. 7065. An act for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana;

H. R. 7066. An act for the relief of Set-suko Amano;

H. R. 7073. An act for the relief of Koto Kogami Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu;

H. R. 7199. An act for the relief of Nobuko Maeda;

H. R. 7254. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bernard Smith;

H. R. 7278. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner;

H. R. 7283. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jack B. Meyer;

H. R. 7292. An act for the relief of Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita;

H. R. 7362. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Kono);

H. R. 7363. An act for the relief of Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi;

H. R. 7416. An act for the relief of Suzuko Takanashi;

H. R. 7485. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Margarite Noe;

H. R. 7614. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Knauff;

H. R. 7656. An act for the relief of David George Callaway;

H. R. 7658. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Ito;

H. R. 7682. An act for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson; and

H. R. 7708. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. certain easements and rights-of-way within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will take the liberty of suggesting that, without objection and without speeches or debate, he will recognize Senators who wish to present routine matters for the RECORD or introduce bills or submit resolutions. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COVERING INTO TREASURY OF MONEYS ARISING FROM CHARGES AND DEDUCTIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1069) to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions, which was, on page 2, line 2, to strike out "and" and insert "or."

Mr. MAYBANK. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (S. Doc. No. 167)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions for the fiscal year 1951, Department of Defense, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITION

Mr. GREEN presented a resolution of the legislature of the State of Rhode

Island, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolution memorializing Congress in the plea to revive the Civilian Conservation Corps for unemployed youths between the ages of 17 and 23

Whereas United States Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, has introduced into Congress a bill to revive the Civilian Conservation Corps which functioned during the 1930's; and

Whereas the Senator says "this is to be regarded as an investment in human and natural resources that will repay big dividends in increased national wealth, lowered raw material costs, and trained and adjusted young manpower, the most precious of all our resources"; and

Whereas the Civilian Conservation Corps would be for youths between 17 and 23 who are unemployed, not going to school and are on the towns, who would work under purely civilian management in national parks and forests, on flood control and in restoring grazing and farm lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, which has already created a special committee to make a study of the desirability of the adoption of a yield tax on woodlands in this State, now endorses the restoration of the Civilian Conservation Corps, as indicated in the proposed congressional bill, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their best efforts to have this legislation enacted into law; directing the Secretary of State to transmit to said Senators and Representatives duly certified copies of this resolution.

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES—RESOLUTION OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution adopted by the Twenty-eighth Annual Conference of the Izaak Walton League of America, which met at Des Moines, Iowa, during the latter part of March this year. This resolution endorses the International Treaty on Great Lakes Fisheries.

Included in the resolution is a reference to the critical problem of sea lamprey, the vampire eels which have destroyed so much of the commercial fishing on the Great Lakes. I have taken up this issue on many occasions with the Fish and Wildlife Service, and I mention this matter at the time because I am delighted to see that the Izaak Walton League is continuing its own deep interest in the problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution of this distinguished organization be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL TREATY ON GREAT LAKES FISHERIES

Whereas the commercial fisheries of the Great Lakes represent one of the vital food resources of this country supporting an industry involving millions of dollars in capital and thousands of families; and

Whereas said industry has in the past been regulated by piecemeal laws and regulations adopted by the respective States bordering upon the Great Lakes but without any uniformity or long-range programs or understanding, with the result that the industry has been deteriorating, the supply of the

better species of fish has been decreasing and in some instances has disappeared entirely; and

Whereas the industry is today faced to a greater degree than ever before by pollution and silting of fishing grounds, by invasion of predator species such as the sea lamprey, by overfishing and lack of adequate control measures, and

Whereas a treaty between the United States and Canada providing the ground work for proper management and husbandry of this resource on both sides of the border was prepared after years of thought, study, and co-operation between various states, the Federal Government, and the Government of Canada, which treaty was signed by the contracting parties in 1946 but has not to date been ratified by the Senate of the United States, largely because of localized political opposition: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That the Izaak Walton League of America renew and reiterate its urgent request to the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate that immediate steps be taken looking to ratification of said treaty and the prompt enactment by the Congress of such legislation as may be necessary to implement it.

RADIO CLEAR CHANNELS—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL GRANGE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the National Grange at its national convention held in Sacramento, Calif., last November, a copy of which has just been sent to me, which urges that there be no further breakdown in the number of clear-channel broadcasting stations in the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY DELEGATES OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE AT THEIR EIGHTY-THIRD ANNUAL SESSION IN SACRAMENTO, CALIF., NOVEMBER 1949; PORTLAND, MAINE, NOVEMBER 1948

RADIO CLEAR CHANNELS

We reiterate our stand as taken at the national convention held at Portland, Maine, in 1948 and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the National Grange delegates realizing the necessity of insuring reliable and satisfactory radio service to the farm population of the United States, reiterate our previous recommendations that there be no further breakdown in the number of clear-channel broadcasting stations in our country; and we further urge that the Federal Communications Commission grant permission to clear-channel stations to operate at sufficient power to provide adequate service to all rural areas; and we emphasize that the United States Department of State should resist any attempt by other North American countries to establish stations on frequencies at present assigned to clear-channel stations in the United States."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2155. A bill to authorize the cancellation or settlement of claims of the District of Columbia against the estates of recipients of old-age assistance; without amendment (Rept. No. 1532).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. LEHMAN introduced Senate bill 3528, to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 3529. A bill for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3530. A bill to abolish the position of mail handler in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3531. A bill for the relief of Doctor Chao-Jen Chen, Dr. Janet Wang Chen, and Eleanor Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for Mr. DOWNNEY):

S. J. Res. 175. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the California World Progress Exposition; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Mr. KEFAUVER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 176, to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by S. Res. 202, 81st Cong., which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

NIAGARA DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "Niagara Development Act of 1950." It is a bill to carry out the purposes expressed in President Truman's message to the Senate yesterday. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement I have prepared on this bill to be printed in the body of the RECORD together with an analysis of the bill.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and analysis presented by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3528) to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement and analysis presented by Mr. LEHMAN are as follows:

MAY 3, 1950.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN INTRODUCING NIAGARA DEVELOPMENT ACT

For more than a century, the Niagara Falls, one of the scenic wonders of North America, has attracted visitors both from America and from abroad. And for almost a century men have dreamed of harnessing the mighty power of that cataract to serve man's needs. Some of that power has indeed been harnessed during the past 50 years. But a really complete mobilization of that tremendous resource has waited until this very day.

Yesterday, the President sent to the Senate for its advice and consent a treaty with the Dominion of Canada providing for the preservation of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls and for the utilization of the power potential of the Niagara in such a manner as to preserve and enhance the scenic wonders of that river and at the same time to make some of those waters available for the benefit and welfare of the peoples of the United States and Canada.

I want to emphasize that the whole object of the treaty is to protect and develop both resources—the resource of beauty and the resource of power. I have always been committed, as a private citizen, as Governor of New York, and now as United States Senator to the preservation of Niagara Falls as a scenic wonder on one hand and the development of power in the public interest, on the other. I was pleased to note that the President in his message to the Congress yesterday took a similar stand on behalf of the administration.

I am today introducing a comprehensive bill, the Niagara Development Act of 1950, for the utilization of the power possibilities of the Niagara as well as for the preservation of the scenic beauties of the Niagara. This same bill is being introduced simultaneously in the House of Representatives by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

This bill represents the studies and the work of many months and, in fact, of many years. It utilizes the successful findings of conservationists, power experts, and engineering surveyors for over two generations.

Our bill proposes a power development in accordance with plans recently completed by the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission for a staged development which would install new United States capacity of 1,330,000 kilowatts and would provide an increase in the average annual energy available in the United States of 7,900,000,000 kilowatt-hours. The total installation at Niagara Falls would then be 1,695,000 kilowatts, including the privately owned plant (Schoellkopf) now in operation there. The available annual energy would be 11,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours as compared to the present availability of 3,700,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

New York alone would be able to absorb this energy and more by the time these facilities can be put into operation, which is estimated to be about 3½ years after the start of construction. In recognition of the fact, however, that States adjacent to western New York, namely, Pennsylvania and Ohio, have a legitimate interest in the power from this great waterway, I make provision in my bill for means whereby they can secure some of this power.

Our bill provides for the Federal construction of these works by the Chief of Army Engineers, whose experts have done much of the surveying, boring, and testing of this area over the past years. The project works, under the terms of our bill, would be sold to the State of New York for the operation and maintenance of those works in the public interest.

We propose to protect the interests of the people of the United States and of the people of New York State by providing that the transfer of facilities to New York State should occur under the terms of an agreement to be negotiated between the State of New York and the Federal Government. This agreement would be subject to approval by the State Legislature of the State of New York and by the Congress.

This agreement would include all the provisions necessary for the protection of the Federal interests, of the national defense interests, and of the interests of the eventual consumers of the power. The whole object of our bill is to provide power to the people

at low cost. I think this is an essential disposition of this great natural resource, which is one of the resources of the American people, and must not be subject to exploitation for the benefit of a small group of any kind.

I believe New York to be the proper operator and guardian of this power development. It is, of course, necessary that the State of New York enact the necessary legislation authorizing the New York Power Authority, for instance, to operate this project. The present authorization for the New York Power Authority extends only to the St. Lawrence. It would also be necessary for New York State to agree to the provisions necessary to protect the Federal interest and the interest of the people of New York as well as of the adjacent States. I have no doubt that the people of New York will indicate their complete acceptance of this opportunity to acquire ownership of a great power facility whose eventual potentiality will be greater than that of Grand Coulee Dam.

In line with President Truman's proposal to the Congress of a month ago for a study of a possible northeastern power pool—a proposal which I endorsed—our bill makes provision for the coordinated operation of the Niagara project with the other power projects which may be involved in the pool, but only in the event that such a pool is established either by Congress or by compact among the several States.

Our bill is in the pattern of the arrangements originally envisioned for the development of the St. Lawrence project. Indeed, the way is left open for the operation of these projects in tandem, as soon as the St. Lawrence project is authorized and constructed.

Our bill conforms to the principles of the Federal Power Act of 1920 by providing that the Federal Power Commission shall issue a license for the operation of this project. This, however, is not a matter for discretion by the Federal Power Commission. The Federal Power Commission is directed to issue the license, provided that the agreement between New York State and the Federal Government is consummated and all the conditions provided in this act are fulfilled.

New York State is at the present time in the process of applying for a license from the Federal Power Commission for the development of the power potentialities in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence. In this application, the Federal Power Commission has full discretion whether to grant or reject this application. Under my bill no such discretion would be granted the Federal Power Commission. The Federal Power Commission would be directed to issue the license if all the conditions are met. Where there is inconsistency between the licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act and the provisions of the proposed Niagara Development Act, the provisions of the latter will prevail.

In the event that New York State does not choose to take advantage of its opportunity to acquire these facilities, my bill would leave the way open for an agency later to be created by Congress to operate these facilities in the interests of the people of the State of New York and of the adjacent States.

In the event that no such agency is established by the time the project is ready to deliver power, and if New York State is not then prepared to assume control, the provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944 would pertain, and the project would continue to be operated by the Chief of Engineers and the power would be disposed of by the Interior Department. I have sought in every way to protect the interests of the people of New York State and the interests of the duly constituted authorities of New York State.

It is my earnest hope and desire that this will be a New York project for the primary

benefit of the people of New York. Necessarily the interests of the adjacent States must be recognized and the interests of the Federal Government must be protected. The Niagara River, after all, is the outlet for four of the Great Lakes, discharging the waters from this great system of lakes of the Middle West into Lake Ontario on its way to the St. Lawrence and to the Atlantic. This great system of waterways is the lifeblood of the Middle West and of the Northeast. The great drainage system which it represents is one of the priceless heritages of the American people.

On their way from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario, the Great Lakes waters drop a total of 326 feet, the magnificent descent off the Niagara escarpment providing the beauty of the Niagara Falls and the power potentialities that we now propose to develop.

Ours is a complex bill, but its objectives are very simple and its means are equally so. I ask that this bill be given the earliest possible consideration by the Senate, so that the authorization may be on the statute books and a request for suitable appropriations may speedily be made.

The cost of this project under present plans will be either \$350,300,000 or \$308,700,000, depending upon the kind of construction decided upon. This is but a small investment compared to the benefits which the people will derive. The annual value of the additional power developed on the United States side will be \$61,339,000 or one-fifth of the capital cost. This is, of course, a very simplified cost comparison, but it represents in a true sense the value of the project to the public.

ANALYSIS OF NIAGARA DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1950—BILL INTRODUCED BY SENATOR LEHMAN IN THE SENATE AND IN THE HOUSE BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

PURPOSE

To provide for a public development of water power made available to the United States under the terms of the Canadian-United States Niagara Treaty and to insure at the same time the preservation of the scenic beauties of the Niagara Falls.

WHAT THE BILL DOES

1. Authorizes the United States Corps of Engineers to plan and construct the necessary project works.
2. Authorizes and directs the President of the United States to turn over the project works to whatever agency the State of New York may designate by law for this purpose, provided that certain conditions protecting the interests of the people of the State of New York and the interests of the people of the adjacent States and of the Federal Government are met.
3. Provides for the repayment by the State of New York to the Federal Government of such construction costs as are properly allocable to the power development. Costs for works designed solely to preserve the scenic beauty of the Falls are to be borne by the United States Government.
4. Provides that amount and terms of repayment as well as other pertinent conditions shall be covered in an agreement to be negotiated between the United States Government and the State of New York, subject to approval by the Legislature of New York and the Congress.
5. Provides that if the State of New York does not choose to acquire and operate the project or if no agreement is reached by the time the project is ready to deliver power, the power is to be distributed by the United States Government either through an agency authorized by Congress for the purpose or by the Federal agencies authorized to develop and distribute power under the terms of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

ANALYSIS OF BILL BY SECTIONS

Section 1

Statement of national policy and of purpose of the act.

Section 2

A. Authorizes construction of the works in accordance with project plans outlined in report of the Bureau of Power of the Federal Power Commission (September 28, 1949) subject to modification not inconsistent with the act and found advisable by the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission after consultation with the Governors of New York and of other interested States and with other interested Federal agencies.

B. Provides for start of construction as soon as funds are appropriated.

Section 3

A. Authorizes and directs the President to transfer the project facilities to an agency of New York State, when such an agency shall have been authorized to accept and operate these works by the State of New York and when three major conditions will have been met:

1. An agreement shall be negotiated between the United States Government and the government of the State of New York and such agreement shall have been approved both by the Legislature of New York and the United States Congress.

2. (a) The agreement shall include provisions for—

(1) Repayment of costs allocable to power; and

(2) For the maintenance and operation of the project in the public interest—including especially the interests of the State of New York and of other States within economic transmission distance.

(b) Agreement shall prohibit the alienation of any of the waters to any private person or company other than waters over which private persons or corporations already have existing rights.

(c) Agreement shall give full recognition to the interests of national security.

(d) The agreement shall provide for the granting of preference to local government units or their instrumentalities and to co-operatives and other nonprofit organizations.

(e) The agreement shall provide for the construction or acquisition of necessary transmission lines in order to make power available in wholesale quantities to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

(f) Agreement shall provide that project power shall be sold primarily for the benefit of the consumers of electric power at the lowest possible rates (and in such a manner as to encourage the widest possible use.)

(g) Agreement shall provide that contracts for resale of project power shall include provision for establishing resale rates to be fixed by the seller (State of New York) so as to pass on the savings to the consumers.

(h) Agreement shall provide that if and when a northeastern power pool or some other agency for the coordinated operation of power facilities in the Northeast shall be created, either by future Federal legislation or by compacts between the States, arrangements shall be made by the State of New York for the coordinated operation of the Niagara power facilities with those of the pool.

(i) Agreement shall provide that other States within economic transmission distance may obtain needed power from Niagara by contract with New York State; if any State is denied what it believes to be its fair share, the Federal Power Commission, after full and open hearings, shall have the power to determine the arrangements whereby the power shall be sold to these States within economic transmission distance.

3. (a) New York State will apply to the Federal Power Commission for a license for op-

eration of the project; Federal Power Commission is thereupon directed to issue the license, provided that all the conditions referred to above have been satisfied.

(b) In case of any conflict between the licensing provision of the Federal Power Act and the provisions of this act, the provisions of this act shall pertain.

B. Eighteen months after the beginning of construction the President is directed to send a report to Congress on the state of negotiations with the State of New York.

C. If transfer of the power facility to the State of New York has not been completely accomplished in accordance with the above provisions by the time power is available from any generating unit of the project, the project shall be maintained and power disposed of by any agency which Congress may have meanwhile created for the purpose; if no such agency has been created, the project shall be maintained and operated by the Chief of Engineers and the power shall be disposed of in accordance with the Flood Control Act of 1944 (by the Secretary of the Interior).

NOTE.—In this analysis—

Section 2, A and B correspond to section 2 in the bill.

Section 3, A corresponds to section 3 (a) in the bill.

Section 3 (A) (1) corresponds to section 3 (a) (1) in the bill, etc.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. HENDRICKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 702. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett;

H. R. 1814. An act for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz;

H. R. 2464. An act for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll;

H. R. 3169. An act granting permanent residence to certain Spanish physicians residing in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3305. An act for the relief of the estate of Jose Salgado Santos;

H. R. 3994. An act for the relief of John D. Lange;

H. R. 4011. An act for the relief of Stavros Matheos (also known as Steve Matheos or Matheou);

H. R. 4163. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. C. S. Walker;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Dr. Ferdinand Schiappa;

H. R. 4371. An act for the relief of Shiro Takemura;

H. R. 4628. An act for the relief of John G. Essenberg;

H. R. 4806. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Drago;

H. R. 5051. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria;

H. R. 5150. An act for the relief of Ira D. Doyal and Clyde Doyal;

H. R. 5151. An act for the relief of the estate of Louridine Livermore and the estate of Dorothy E. Douglas;

H. R. 5250. An act for the relief of J. L. Smelcer;

H. R. 5639. An act for the relief of Ivan E. Townsend;

H. R. 5972. An act for the relief of Ivar G. Johnson;

H. R. 6053. An act for the relief of Continental Insurance Co., Federal Insurance Co., and National Fire Insurance Co., of Hartford, Conn.;

H. R. 6169. An act for the relief of Mary Mitsuye Nishihama Yabe;

H. R. 6198. An act for the relief of the First National Bank in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 6449. An act for the relief of Mrs. L. M. Cox and Mrs. M. R. Nickle;

H. R. 6489. An act for the relief of United Transformer Co. (formerly United Transformer Corp.);

H. R. 6505. An act to legalize the entry of Mrs. David Munson Osborne (nee Janet Mary Tole), a native of New Zealand;

H. R. 6652. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fujiko Chichie Imbert, wife, and Robert Imbert, Jr., son of an American soldier;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Ralph E. Brown;

H. R. 7050. An act for the relief of Louie Gam Yean;

H. R. 7065. An act for the relief of Kazuko Miyama Akana and Chang King Akana;

H. R. 7066. An act for the relief of Setsuko Amano;

H. R. 7073. An act for the relief of Koto Kogami Kitsu and Jeannette Akemi Kitsu;

H. R. 7199. An act for the relief of Nobuko Maeda;

H. R. 7254. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bernard Smith;

H. R. 7278. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clara M. Fortner;

H. R. 7283. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jack B. Meyer;

H. R. 7292. An act for the relief of Erio Louis Tomita and Fumiko Tomita;

H. R. 7362. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willard Thulin (formerly Jutta Kono);

H. R. 7363. An act for the relief of Suzuko Yagi and Anne Yagi;

H. R. 7416. An act for the relief of Suzuko Takanashi;

H. R. 7485. An act for the relief of Mrs. Maria Margarite Noe;

H. R. 7614. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Knauff;

H. R. 7656. An act for the relief of David George Callaway;

H. R. 7658. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Ito; and

H. R. 7682. An act for the relief of Mrs. Akiko Osada Gustafson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7708. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the Monmouth Consolidated Water Co. certain easements and rights-of-way within the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, Earle, N. J.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3675. An act for the relief of Erik H. Lindman; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONVENTION ON ROAD TRAFFIC—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting Executive O. Eighty-first Congress, second session, a convention on road traffic which was open for signature from September 19, 1949, until December 31, 1949, and during that period was signed on

behalf of the United States of America and 20 other states, which, with the accompanying convention, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the ban of secrecy be removed from the convention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a convention on road traffic which was open for signature from September 19, 1949, until December 31, 1949, and during that period was signed on behalf of the United States of America and 20 other states. There is also transmitted, for the purpose of receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification thereof, a certified copy of a related protocol concerning occupied countries or territories which was open for signature at the same time as the convention.

The purposes of the convention are explained in the report of the Secretary of State which is transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 3, 1950.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of convention on road traffic; (3) certified copy of related protocol; (4) excerpt from report of United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on Road and Motor Transport.)

THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM—ADDRESS BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Road to Socialism," delivered by Hon. J. Lindsay Almond, attorney general of Virginia, at Madison College, Harrisonburg, Va., on April 19, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL THOMAS C. KINKAID—EDITORIAL BY HARRY H. SCHLACHT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, Naval Warrior of the Pacific," written by Harry H. Schlacht and published in the Hearst newspapers, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHITHER THE RAILROADS?—ADDRESS BY M. W. CLEMENT

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Whither the Railroads?" delivered by M. W. Clement, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad, before the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED SALE OF UNITS IN WESTCHESTER APARTMENTS—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Evening Star of April 19, 1950, regarding the proposed sale of units in the Westchester Apartments in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KERR NATURAL-GAS BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE TULSA TRIBUNE

[Mr. KERR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune of April 22, 1950, regarding the Kerr natural-gas bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

PASSAGE OF RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL—ARTICLE BY C. F. BYRNS

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of the recent passage by the Senate of the bill authorizing rivers and harbors and flood-control projects, written by C. F. Byrns, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMEMORATION OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, 159 years ago today the Republic of Poland adopted its famous constitution of May the 3d. In commemoration of this historical event I have prepared a brief statement and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement by Mr. IVES was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES IN COMMEMORATION OF POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY, MAY 3, 1950

Today, May 3, freedom-loving peoples all over the world will commemorate the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. Barely 2 years after the acceptance of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, the brave Polish people produced the Magna Carta of Polish parliamentary history—a document instantly recognized and hailed by the leading thinkers of the day as a major milestone in man's progress toward democracy.

Those familiar with Polish history have no difficulty in understanding why it was that the Poles, a Slavonic people of eastern central Europe, should be the authors and promulgators of the first written democratic constitution to be adopted by a nation of the Old World. For the Poles are the possessors of an ancient and enviable history of devotion to the parliamentary system of government.

Among the Slavonic peoples of Europe, only the Poles can point with justifiable pride to a record of constant and deep-rooted faith in the parliamentary tradition throughout their independent existence as a nation. And nowhere else on the Continent of Europe among all the states which have survived down to 1950, is the unbroken continuity of the existence of a legislative body a feature of national life.

Thus, it was only natural that during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when the enlightened ideas of such western philosophers as Locke and Rousseau were being greeted with enthusiasm by the great intellectuals of the age, the Polish people should produce a document immediately acclaimed as an outstanding political achievement rivaling in scope of concept and boldness of language the American Declaration of Independence.

A brief examination of the high lights of the constitution of May the 3d, will reveal instantly the reasons why it is ranked among the foremost documents in the evolution of parliamentary democracy.

This constitution, adopted May 3, 1791, by the Congress of the Republic of Poland, proclaimed as a primary postulate the sovereignty of the people in the state. This important principle was stated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and on a lasting foundation."

Like the Constitution of the United States, the May the 3d constitution provided for three separate and equal branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial. Also guaranteed were the important principles of rule by majority, the secrecy of the ballot at public elections, and—an unprecedented feature of political life in eastern or central Europe at the time—the extension of full protection of the law to the peasant. This part of the constitution was given even greater significance when it was supplemented in 1795 by Kosciusko's famous proclamation granting full civil rights to the peasant.

The constitution of May the 3d also contained a ringing proclamation of the principle of freedom of religion:

"We . . . owe to all people of whatever persuasion, peace in matters of faith, and the protection of government; consequently we assure, to all persuasions and religions, freedom and liberty, according to the laws of the country, and in all dominions of the republic."

Other equally enlightened and courageous provisions of the constitution of May the 3d—all expressed in language as noble and as inspiring as that of the passages I have quoted—aimed at the correction of parliamentary weaknesses and the achievement of various social reforms. The result was an inevitable immortality for this historic document.

So high was the torch of human liberty raised by the May the 3d constitution, however, that the tyrannical monarchs of Poland's neighbors, alarmed at this latest menace to the perpetuation of their own despotic rule, dismembered Poland in the partitions of 1793 and 1795. Poland fell, not because she could not live, but because, inspired and strengthened by her democratic ideals, she chose to live only as a free nation.

Today Poland again finds herself enslaved. But the basic elements in the hearts of the people which produced the constitution of May the 3d still live with a vitality which will, I am certain, win their freedom for the Poles again. And as we here salute the Polish people on Polish Constitution Day, let us renew and refresh our determination to hasten the dawn of that day of freedom for Poland. No nation has shown itself more deserving of liberty and independence.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in commemoration of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish 3d of May Constitution.

There being no objection, Mr. BENTON's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENTON

Americans of Polish descent and Poles in free countries throughout the world observe today a date which is very close to their hearts.

This date marks the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the signing of Poland's bill of rights—the 3d of May constitution. It was on May 3, 1791, just 2 years after the United States adopted its Constitution, that signatures were affixed to a document giving to the common man in Poland the freedoms known only in a democracy. Its purpose was to perform true democratic reforms and to improve an existing form of government by peaceful methods. It granted liberty to all citizens, without discrimination.

The Polish 3d of May constitution was among the most liberal and most democratic of its day. It stated: "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and objective being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

But the liberation of the Polish people came too late, for in 1795 the Republic, with a history dating back to 966 and a history as a great power as far back as the fourteenth century, suffered its third partition.

Poland today is a tragic nation. After having fought gallantly on the field of battle, side by side with our own soldiers, it is at present under the domination of Soviet Russia. It is, therefore, a serious obligation for all of us to strive for the restoration of a free Poland. For until these brave people and other subjugated nations are free the peace of the whole world can never be secure.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate has before it Senate Resolution 202.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to have the attention of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. If those who are supporting Senate Resolution 202 and those opposed to it will enter into an agreement to vote on the resolution at 1 o'clock today, and then let the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] follow after 1 o'clock, I shall be agreeable. Otherwise, at the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri I shall have to request that the Senate return to the regular order.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. It will not be possible for me to enter into such a unanimous-consent agreement as the Senator from Texas proposes. As I stated on the floor yesterday, it was then my estimate that my remarks in connection with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would require approximately 2 hours for delivery. I am not able to give positive assurance as to the exact length of time. It might run something over that time. I should like to have it run something less, but I am not at all sure that it would run less than 2 hours.

Mr. President, it is now 25 minutes to 12. It is only 1 hour and 25 minutes to 1 o'clock. I realize, of course, that in addition to the time necessary for the speaker to deliver his address, that Members of the Senate may desire to interrogate the speaker. I should certainly not want to confine myself to any specific time.

I want to make it perfectly clear, though, Mr. President, that it is my desire to proceed with the resolution. I think it is entirely proper that the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] should be recognized at this time for his remarks, which I understand are to be with respect to the unfinished business, the economic cooperation bill. The bill which is subject to being set aside temporarily is the unfinished business. But, Mr. President, I do not think it is at all appropriate that in connection with a resolution of this great importance I should be restricted to the time which has been mentioned by the Senator from Texas.

I may say that I would not be willing to enter into any unanimous-consent agreement at this moment with respect to the time at which the Senate should vote on the resolution.

I shall not trespass further upon the time of the Senate, except to say that I am strongly in favor of the adoption of Senate Resolution 202 as it came from the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration, with two changes only: One, a change to remove the time limitation for the report; the other, a change with respect to the amount of money to be appropriated. I think the amount is too small, and I favor an amendment to increase it.

I am opposed to the substitute which would create a special committee. The substitute was argued yesterday afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

It is with no desire whatsoever to delay the consideration of the resolution that at this time I refuse to enter into any agreement with respect to the time for voting. I assure the Senate, as I did yesterday, that I shall make every effort to have the Senate proceed expeditiously with the resolution. I think it is a most important matter which should be acted upon promptly, and I trust that it can be voted upon during the present day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has not yet been recognized; but the Chair would state that in view of the conversation which occurred yesterday at the time when the Senator from Tennessee requested unanimous consent that the resolution be taken up, at which time the Chair assured the Senator from Missouri that he could be recognized to speak on the resolution or to speak on his amendment to the ECA bill, or that he could call for the regular order, in which event he might speak on his amendment to the ECA bill, the Chair feels that it is his duty to recognize the Senator from Missouri at this time. Therefore, the Chair now recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in answer to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], as well as the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], I wish to say that we have only today and tomorrow to conclude the debate on the ECA bill, because under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senate must vote on the bill on Friday. Under such circumstances, in view of the interests of Senators who wish to discuss the ECA bill and possibly some other matters relative thereto, I cannot imperil the situation by agreeing to have the Senate continue with consideration of the resolution following the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri. I wish to serve notice that I shall be on the floor seeking recognition at the end of the address of the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, whether he will withhold his unanimous-consent request, or at least modify it, so that the time for the further consideration of the resolution may be extended to the extent the distinguished Senator from Missouri and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee may feel necessary, and beyond the time when the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] concludes his remarks.

It does not seem to me—if the Senator from Missouri will yield further to me—that it makes any difference, inasmuch as the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri are to be on the ECA bill, whether the Senator from Missouri speaks first for 2 hours—he has agreed not to exceed that time—on his amendment to the ECA bill, and the Senate then proceeds to consider further the resolution, or whether the Senate proceeds now with the further consideration of the resolution, and then the Senator from Missouri is recognized.

If we were considering the advisability of proceeding to the consideration of an extraneous matter, I would agree that the Senate would be losing time by considering such a matter at this time. However, the junior Senator from Missouri proposes to speak on the unfinished business, the ECA bill; and the senior Senator from Missouri wishes to speak on the resolution which has temporarily displaced the unfinished business, the ECA bill, prior to the vote upon it.

I am satisfied that if the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee will withhold his unanimous-consent request until after the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri, no time will be lost, and an agreement can be reached to have the Senate vote upon the resolution sometime this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has not submitted a unanimous-consent request; he simply notified the Senate that at the end of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri, he would call for the regular order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, Mr. President; that is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was answering the telephone when the distinguished Senator from Texas was speaking. I understood that probably a unanimous-consent request would be made.

So I have said that I trust that the Senator from Texas will not ask for the regular order at the conclusion of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri, but will withhold such a request until some arrangement can be made whereby the Senator from Texas can be assured that a vote will be had today on the resolution, and that no

time will be lost so far as the ECA bill is concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Texas will reconsider his idea of calling for the regular order at the time he has indicated. I am very anxious that Senate Resolution 202 be agreed to. As suggested by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, I agree that the time devoted to consideration of the resolution will not be lost.

The distinguished junior Senator from Missouri is going to speak upon the ECA bill. Following the conclusion of his remarks, we would be able to proceed with the further consideration of the resolution and dispose of it in a short time. Although I wish to make a few remarks, they will be briefer than I originally had intended them to be, so that, so far as I am concerned, a vote can be had in a short time upon the resolution.

It is an important matter. I do not feel that Senators can agree upon a definite hour for voting on the resolution, because questions may be asked of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, as well as of the Senator from Tennessee and of myself.

So I hope the Senator from Texas will reconsider the matter and will wait as long as he can before he exercises his right to call for the regular order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the junior Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to Senators who have been insisting on continuing with the resolution that the resolution was brought up last evening with the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, thinking it could be promptly disposed of. As usually happens, when the door is opened an inch for someone, he sticks his foot in, and when an hour and a half has been consumed more time is desired. So I shall have to adhere to my announced intention that, at the end of the speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], I shall insist on returning to the regular order. We have a great many other matters of high importance awaiting consideration.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield before he begins his speech?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely want to make the observation that this is exactly what I anticipated last night would happen. Here we have a resolution pending, which deals with a very important question. The Senator from Texas was good enough to permit the unfinished business to be temporarily laid aside in order that the resolution might be debated. The Senate met this morning at 11 o'clock upon the theory that we might be able to conclude consideration of the resolution which is now before the Senate and that

probably we could get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the resolution. But, instead of working on the resolution which the distinguished Senator from Texas permitted to displace temporarily the consideration of ECA, we are now back on the ECA bill.

Mr. President, we ought to be considering the Kefauver resolution. It is the pending business before the Senate at the present time. Instead of that, we are now going off on a 2-hour or 3-hour journey on ECA.

Obviously, after the junior Senator from Missouri finishes his speech on ECA, the senior Senator from Missouri will come along with another 2-hour speech on the Kefauver resolution. That will bring on another 2 hours' debate from other Senators who are also vitally interested in the Kefauver resolution, especially so, in view of the statement of the senior Senator from Missouri that he is unalterably opposed to the substitute offered by the able Senator from Tennessee. So it would be impossible to get through with the Kefauver resolution in a matter of 2 hours, unless it is possible to reach some kind of unanimous-consent agreement, and, if something is not done similar to what the Senator from Texas suggests, before we get through we shall be on the Kefauver resolution probably 2 days.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say in reply to the Senator from Illinois that since I have been a Member of this body I have recognized the necessity of leadership on the floor, and although I felt that last night I had staked out a claim to the floor this morning, I called the minority leader and told him I should be glad if he would consult with the majority leader, saying to the minority leader that any arrangement which was made by them would be agreeable to me. I understood that the two leaders had conferred, and that it was agreed I should have the floor. It is for that reason that I am prepared to speak at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri is absolutely incorrect insofar as my having agreed that he should have the floor. I protested last night all along with respect to that. I consented only after I talked with the Vice President, who said he felt morally obligated to recognize the Senator from Missouri. The Senate convened at 11 o'clock this morning on the theory that the Kefauver resolution would be debated, not the matter which the junior Senator from Missouri is now proposing to debate. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. KEM. I do not know where the Senator from Illinois got that theory, since the Record is very clear on the subject. It clearly appears from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday that my agreement to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Tennessee was conditioned on my obtaining the floor when the Senate convened today. I reiterated that position on several occasions, and stated it while the Senator from Illinois was present on the Senate floor; so, if the Senator got any other idea, it was either because he did not hear the Senator from Missouri or be-

cause he did not understand the very clear statement which was made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Here is what the Senator from Illinois said:

I would not object to recessing until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning providing we are going to discuss the issue of the Senate resolution. But the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] just now served notice that he is not going to agree to any unanimous-consent request for tomorrow unless he is recognized immediately following the convening of the session tomorrow. There is no point in coming in at 11 o'clock tomorrow under those circumstances. As I see it, there is no point in debating the resolution unless we can finish it. So there is no point in meeting at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning under those circumstances.

Mr. KEM. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that at no time did I accede to the idea of the majority leader, when he made that statement on the floor; but I also invite his attention to the fact that I communicated with him this morning, through the minority leader, and, through the minority leader, told him I would be glad to accede to any plans the leadership of the Senate adopted. I am still willing to do that, notwithstanding the fact that I have an address which I am ready to begin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have proposed an amendment to the pending measure. I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 107. Section 118 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Administrator shall terminate the provisions of assistance under this title to any participating country if the government of such country, or any agency or subdivision thereof, shall, after the date of enactment of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1950, acquire or operate, in whole or in part, any basic industry thereof, other than industries the acquisition of which was completed prior to the date of enactment of such act."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is read for the information of the Senate. It is not technically offered, because another amendment is pending.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed amendment is to prevent the dollars of the American taxpayers being used by socialistic governments of Marshall-plan countries to nationalize or socialize additional basic industries. Let me make this clear. The amendment is not an attempt to undo what has already been done. But if adopted it would prevent further use of American dollars in new socialistic schemes.

Members of the Senate will recall that a similar amendment was proposed last session. The Senate did not see fit to give its approval at that time. However, subsequent developments have made the need for such an amendment all the more urgent. Regardless of what may occur in future months, the American taxpayers are entitled to the protection its adoption would give to the use of their money.

1. IT IS ILLOGICAL FOR THE UNITED STATES TO FINANCE MARXIST SOCIALISM IN AN EFFORT TO BLOCK OFF MARXIST COMMUNISM

Mr. President, socialism has been described as a "river highway down which Communists find their journey much easier because a channel has been made and obstacles have been swept aside."

Webster's New International Dictionary describes communism as "any theory or system of social organization involving common ownership of the agents of production, and some approach to equal distribution of the products of industry."

Webster describes socialism as "a political and economic theory of social organization based on collective or governmental ownership and democratic management of the essential means for the production and distribution of goods."

According to Webster's dictionary, then, socialism and communism are practically one and the same.

Both socialism and communism are inspired by the doctrines of Karl Marx. The late Prof. H. J. Laski, writing on behalf of the British Socialist Party headquarters in a foreword to a May 1948 reprint of the Communist Manifesto, had this to say:

In presenting this centenary volume of the Communist Manifesto the Labour Party acknowledges its indebtedness to Marx and Engels as the two men who have been the inspiration of the whole working-class movement * * * who, remembering that these were the demands of the Manifesto, can doubt our common inspiration (Communist Manifesto—Socialist Landmark, by Prof. H. J. Laski, Allen & Unwin, May 1948).

John Strachey, the newly appointed British Minister of War, has said:

It is impossible to establish communism as the immediate successor to capitalism. It is accordingly proposed to establish socialism which can be put in the place of our present decaying capitalism. Hence, Communists work for the establishment of socialism as a necessary transition stage on the road to communism.

Socialism and communism, then, have the same objective, namely, the nationalization of the means of production and distribution. They differ only in the method they utilize to attain their objectives. The Socialist prefers to use peaceful methods of infiltration. The Communist is willing to resort to force and violence to accomplish the results which both he and the Socialist desire.

In the U. S. S. R., the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Communists control the government. In Great Britain and other countries of western Europe, followers of the other branch of Marxism—socialism—control the governments.

So we have this strange, illogical, contradictory situation. The United States,

under the Marshall plan, is furnishing billions of dollars to finance Marxist socialism, in an effort to block off Marxist communism. Does it make sense for us to furnish dollars to such Socialist leaders as British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin, who has said, referring to the association between the present Socialist government of Great Britain and the government of Russia: "Left can speak to left in comradeship and confidence," and John Strachey, who brazenly admits that Communists work for the establishment of socialism as a stepping stone to communism?

II. THE CASE OF THE BRITISH SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, I shall emphasize the case of Great Britain, because her Socialist government receives the "lion's share" of Marshall-plan aid. Nearly two and one-half billion dollars has been made available to that government under the Marshall plan. Next year the British Marxists are scheduled to receive \$687,000,000 out of the \$3,000,000,000 proposed to be sent to the nations of western Europe.

A. AMERICAN DOLLARS HAVE FINANCED THE BRITISH HAND-OUT STATE

On February 23, last, the British Socialist government bought, with American dollars, a new lease on life. Only a vast array of postwar gifts from America enabled that government to stagger through one costly dose of Marxism after another. Already one-fifth of her total economy is nationalized, and the noose of nationalization draws ever tighter about what remains of the British free-enterprise system.

It is not at all surprising that the Socialists emerged victorious last February. Indeed, what is surprising is that the Conservatives made the showing they did.

American dollars have served to cushion the British people from the severe privations which inevitably accompany the handout state.

Socialist subsidies on food, made possible by Marshall Plan dollars, enable British housewives to buy groceries for as little as one-fourth the price American housewives pay for the same items.

The British pay 4 cents for a loaf of bread. They pay 21 cents for a pound of butter, 12 cents for a quart of milk. Compare that with the prices American housewives pay for these items. These cheaper British prices are possible only because the British Socialist Government makes up the difference with subsidies, and it has been able to do this only because of the munificent gifts of dollars from the American taxpayers.

The British program of socialized medicine, which Oscar Ewing so fervently admires, could not have been carried out without American aid.

Last fall, during the famous dollar talks in Washington, Mr. Eugene Black, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, made some hard-hitting, if-the-shoe-fits remarks. Mr. Black said in part:

It has been pretty well demonstrated, I think, that productive efficiency cannot be brought about merely through Government edict or exhortation. * * * Since

World War II many governments have committed themselves to extensive programs of social welfare. No one can dispute their right to follow this course, if they have the means to undertake it. Unfortunately, however, it has become apparent that many countries cannot now afford ambitious programs of social services.

The London Economist on April 1, 1950, made some pertinent observations about spending in Great Britain. It said:

A wrong conception has grown up that the central budget is today so much larger than before the war mainly because of the increased expenditure arising out of wars, past and prospective. This is not so.

This category of expenditure, in which war pensions and interest on the national debt are included, is today just about the same proportion of the national income as before the war. It is the social expenditure which has enlarged so much that it is now 17.5 percent of the national income compared with about 10 percent in the 1930's. It is, therefore, social rather than defense spending which dominates the budget.

The British Socialist Government has nationalized 10 important basic industries. Without American aid, this socialization process would have bankrupted the British economy. More than \$500,000,000 worth of Marshall plan counterpart funds have been used to reduce the British national debt, swollen by the purchase, with Government bonds, of nationalized industries.

Most of the industries which the Socialist Government have taken over are operating in the red—deep in the red. According to Winston Churchill:

Every major industry which the Socialists have nationalized, without exception, has passed from the profitable or self-supporting side of our national balance-sheet to the loss-making debit side. * * * All nationalized industries, I assert, have ceased to be services and assets to the public and become instead burdens upon it.

The collective total of the losses to date of nationalized industries amounts to some 75,000,000 pounds sterling, or \$210,000,000, based on the current exchange rate.

During the last 3 years the Government-owned civil airways lost nearly \$90,000,000.

The Government-owned transport system has been steadily losing money at the rate of \$1,500,000 every week. Part of the losses of these socialized industries have been covered by short-term borrowing, which, of course, also increases the British national debt.

On May 18, 1949, Sir Stafford Cripps, British Chancellor of the Exchequer, told the House of Commons:

The honorable member talks about nationalization at a loss. It is quite a false conception to consider that it is necessary to make a profit out of any industry, except under a capitalist system.

We may remind you, Sir Stafford, that none of your socialized industries need operate at a profit as long as the American free-enterprise system underwrites your heavy losses.

Vast quantities of Marshall-plan raw materials and machinery have been given to the British Socialist Government for distribution to nationalized industries as it has seen fit. During the

period April 3, 1948, through February 28, 1950, more than \$25,000,000 worth of ECA construction, mining, and conveying equipment was made available to the British Government, and much of this went to the nationalized coal industry. Large quantities of transportation equipment was also given to the Socialist government for distribution to the socialized transport system.

Last fall, Representative BOLTON of Ohio, a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, made an on-the-spot inspection of conditions in Britain and other countries of western Europe.

Upon completion of her trip, Mrs. BOLTON reported her findings to the House. She said, among other things:

To a statement that I made to one group telling that the American people were not particularly enthusiastic about further bolstering England's socialistic government with American taxpayers' dollars, came the argument that the American dollars were not bolstering their Socialist government; that the American dollars which we are sending them are not being used to pay for the welfare services rendered by the government. "For that purpose we are using British pounds," they said. Whereupon, I retorted, "But if you did not have the American dollars to spend for your indispensables, could your pounds be put to use in developing or perfecting your social-welfare and nationalization programs?"

Mrs. BOLTON said:

That question still remained unanswered when I crossed the Channel to France.

Representative BOLTON also reported:

From an intelligent, earnest young Socialist, leader of his party, I indeed received a severe shock. Our discussion was apropos the British economic problems. He declared boldly that American money must continue to come to England. Whereupon I said to him, "Do you realize what you have said? That you, a Socialist citizen of a Socialist country, expect to receive continuing support from us, a capitalist country?" Continuing, I told him, "If you expect that financial action from us in America, certainly we Americans are going to expect something in return of your people and of your government."

B. BRITISH EDITOR: "STOP THE FLOW OF MONEY"

Mr. President, free-enterprise, Marshall-plan dollars made possible the British Socialist binge, and they will continue to be so used unless the Congress decides otherwise. Or, I may say, until Congress decides otherwise.

On February 26, last, 3 days after the British election, an interesting editorial appeared in a leading British newspaper, the Scottish Sunday Express. The editor, John Gordon, wrote:

It was the people of the United States who were really responsible for the very large vote given to socialism, little as they desire it.

For they provided the money that enabled the Socialists to hide the full extent of their incompetence. It was the loans and the Marshall aid they poured out that sustained the Socialists in office.

That pouring out of money was perhaps the most moving gesture by one people to another in all the history of man.

For the impulse that moved the Americans to do it, for the scale of generosity on which it was done, we can never thank them adequately.

But it was a terribly wrong decision from our point of view. * * *

In fact, all they (the Socialists) did was to use America's money for the building up of socialism, instead of for the building up of Britain, for which it was given.

So, to socialism-fearing Americans, who wonder why it is that Britain has been duped into socialism, I would make this reply: "Don't blame us, blame yourselves. For you did it."

"You did it after full and grave warning of what the consequence would be. For 70 members of Parliament and a strong force of peers foretold in debate the inevitable future, and cautioned you to hold your generous hand."

"What they said then should be reprinted now and spread across your Continent in order that greater knowledge and wise guidance should be available to your generous Nation on that soon-to-come day when the decision to continue or stop the flow of dollars must again be taken."

"When that day comes, if you wish to make amends and save Britain and the world as well, my advice to you is: 'Stop the flow of money. Give Britain a chance to stand on her own feet.'"

Now that our dollars have enabled the Socialist Government to continue in power, we must assume that the Socialists will carry out their plans to liquidate what remains of the British free enterprise system. The all-important iron and steel industry will be nationalized on January 1, 1951, pursuant to a law enacted last year. And as one of the Socialist members of Parliament said:

Once we have nationalized steel we shall have broken the back of capitalist control of industry in Great Britain and its domination forever. If that happens, whatever party is in power, we shall be a Socialist state.

Prime Minister Attlee on March 6, last, dispelled any doubts that his government planned to proceed with the socialization of the iron and steel industry. In response to a question from a member of Parliament as to his government's position on the Iron and Steel Act, Mr. Attlee declared:

That statute is on the statute book and our purpose is to give effect to acts passed by Parliament.

The Socialists also plan to seize the sugar industry, the cement industry, water works, wholesale meat, fruit, and vegetable markets, slaughter houses, all suitable mineral deposits, and industrial insurance.

C. SOCIALISTS ARE NOT SOFT-PEDALING SOCIALIZATION PROGRAM

There has been some speculation that because of the reduced majority of the Socialists in the House of Commons, the Socialist Government might soft-pedal its socialization program. Here is what Mr. Attlee had to say about that on March 6:

We shall, therefore, continue to administer the affairs of the country in the same spirit and on the same principles as we have done during the last 4½ years.

In other words, Mr. President, the present Government of Great Britain does not intend to change a bit.

The Socialist government also has made it clear that it will not hesitate to submit proposals for additional seizure of industries if it decides they are "necessary" for the "national well-being," "even

though they may seem likely to prove contentious."

There can be no doubt then that the Socialists plan to proceed with their nationalization program. And it will be made possible by the dollars of the American taxpayers unless and until the Congress decides otherwise.

The Marxist leaders of Russia have made no secret of the fact that they hope to force the United States to spend itself into destruction. Could it be that the Marxist leaders of Britain have no objection to this? Could they be trying to pump our Treasury dry?

The British Socialist Government has spent nearly \$50,000 on advertising in the financially hard-pressed London Daily Worker, the Communist Party-line newspaper. This has been paid out while the British Treasury was being supplied with Marshall plan dollars from America.

Since the end of World War II the British Socialist Government has received more than \$7,000,000,000 in gifts from the American taxpayers. As fast as dollars were shoveled across the Atlantic Britain's Socialists called for more.

But it seems these generous gifts only serve to whet the appetite of the Socialists for more of our dollars. Like "the man who came to dinner," the British Socialists seem more and more reluctant to wean themselves away from American subsidies.

Now we learn of a new give-away scheme being planned by the British Socialists and American bureaucrats. The British Socialist Government now wants the United States to pay off about \$5,000,000,000 of British debts owed by Britain to other foreign countries, principally India, Pakistan, and Egypt.

It is a slick plan. It does not call for the United States to turn over the dollars directly to Britain for payment of her debts. The British Socialists and Washington bureaucrats are afraid that might not be popular with the American people or the Congress. Instead, the United States would hand out large gifts of money to Britain's creditors in Asia. Then in an "entirely separate transaction," so they say, the countries receiving the hand-outs would wipe out the British debt. So we see there are more ways than one to skin a cat. The British know by experience there are more ways than one to skin Uncle Sam.

If Britain would put her affairs in order—if she would call a halt to her experiments in socialism—she would not need such large grants of aid from America.

III. ECA HAS FINANCED FRENCH EXPERIMENTS IN SOCIALISM

There is another of the Marshall-plan countries far down the highway toward a Marxist state. I refer to France.

Twenty-three of her industries have been nationalized, approximately 40 percent of her total economy.

Most of the nationalized industries in France like those in Britain, are operating at a considerable loss. These losses have served to swell the French national debt. And, here again, as in the case of

Britain, the ECA came to the rescue, permitting the French Government to apply 45,000,000,000 francs of Marshall plan counterpart funds—\$130,500,000 worth—to reducing the French national debt.

In addition, ECA has permitted 320,000,000,000 francs of Marshall plan counterpart funds—\$608,000,000 worth—to be applied to promoting production. Much of this assistance went to the French socialized industries, including the mining, gas, and electricity industries, and the railroads.

Furthermore, large quantities of ECA machinery and equipment of all types was given to the French Government for distribution to its socialized industries. For example, \$32,800,000 worth of electrical apparatus, including generators and motors, was made available to the nationalized electricity industry.

IV. AMENDMENT WOULD NOT INTERFERE IN INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF MARSHALL-PLAN COUNTRIES

Mr. President, it has been said that the adoption of this amendment would constitute an unusual or unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of another country. This argument is as full of holes as Mr. Hoffman has bureaucrats on his pay roll.

In the first place, the amendment is not a directive to any country to do anything. Britain or France or any other Marshall-plan country would still be free to socialize just as many industries as they desired. But the amendment would prevent their using American dollars to do it.

Furthermore, the ECA Act authorizes the Administrator to place all sorts of conditions on the aid he distributes. Mr. Hoffman himself has testified that he has not hesitated to establish those conditions which would permit recovery.

A. UNITED STATES HAS INTERFERED DIRECTLY IN INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF GREECE AND KOREA

Two glaring examples of United States interference in the internal affairs of other countries occurred only quite recently. I refer to the cases of Greece and Korea.

On March 31, last, United States Ambassador to Greece, Henry F. Grady, sent a letter to the Premier of Greece relative to American assistance. Mr. Grady laid down stringent, detailed, and exacting conditions which the Greek Government must either fulfill—or American aid will be shut off.

Mr. Grady wrote:

The American people * * * are entitled to expect, and do expect, that any Greek Government which hopes to continue to receive the aid which they have generously offered, will utilize this assistance to the fullest degree.

In my opinion, only a stable and efficient government supported by the people and by Parliament will be able to act with the courage and the firmness of long-term policy which are essential to the wise use of the aid offered by the American people. Irresponsible talk of adjourning Parliament or of new elections before the new Parliament has had an opportunity to rise to its responsibility, can only create a climate of political and economic uncertainty which may do grave damage to the country's future. * * *

The chief of the ECA mission to Greece and I are in complete accord that, pursuant to the obligations imposed upon us by

the Congress of the United States, we cannot conscientiously approve the commitment of American funds for contemplated new projects until the Greek Government has made basic and binding decisions which will assure the success of the purposes for which the funds are intended.

Foremost among these projects are those which contemplate the construction of four new electric power plants which would more than double the present generation of electricity in Greece and which would bring cheap electric power to many areas of Greece for the first time. The desirability of these new plants is beyond question. They are the keystone to the further industrial and agricultural development of Greece.

Mr. Grady then called upon the Greek Premier to adopt an "adequate financial plan."

An adequate financial plan should include measures which will sharply curtail Government spending on current account, including the armed forces, in order to provide funds for capital investment.

The financial plan should establish a ceiling on the debt which the Government may incur by borrowing from the Bank of Greece or by other means. No change in this debt ceiling should be possible without express authority of Parliament. Subsidies should be curtailed. Government enterprises, such as the state-owned railways, which are a drain on the budget, and the Agricultural Bank, which incurs a deficit in spite of excessive charges to farmers for fertilizer and for loans, should be put on a self-supporting basis, while, at the same time, reducing costs to the users of their services.

The tax system should be simplified and rationalized, and taxes due should be fully collected, to the end that Government revenues will be increased, the investment of private capital will be encouraged, and social justice will result from each citizen paying his fair share of taxes.

Mr. Grady then told the Greek Premier:

A major improvement in Government efficiency is essential to a proper administration of the aid which is offered. The improvement should include the establishment of a Cabinet with a minimum of Government ministries, a greater decentralization of responsibility to nomarchs, and the enactment of a civil-service code to replace the one recently declared invalid because it had not received parliamentary approval.

In order to foster self-help and local initiative, it is advisable that elections of local officials, which have not taken place for 14 years, should be considered for the very near future. To administer whatever electric-power program that may be undertaken, a special agency should be established, independent of politics and with a tenure for its officials long enough to cover the period of construction and initial operation.

The foregoing measures, which we regard as essential to the successful fulfillment of a major capital investment program, should, it seems to me, be proposed by the Greek Government to the Parliament at the earliest possible date. * * *

It is in the hands of the Greek Government and the Greek Parliament to decide whether or not they wish to continue to receive American aid, and hence to accept the responsibilities which will attain its purpose. It is the obligation and intention of the American Government with regard to all Marshall-aid countries to decide whether or not the performance of the recipient Government, whether Greek or any other, justifies a continuance of the aid on the scale heretofore contemplated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Grady's letter be

printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

TEXT OF UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR HENRY F. GRADY'S LETTER TO THE PREMIER OF GREECE ON AMERICAN ASSISTANCE

EXCELLENCY: I feel obliged to bring to the attention of yourself, the new Parliament, and the Greek people the fact that a critical period has been reached in the recovery of Greece.

American aid was designed not only to help establish peace, but to meet the basic needs of the people for food and clothing. It was intended also to create new productive enterprises which, by employing more fully the willing labor of the people and the natural resources of the country, would improve the lot of the people and would render Greece independent of foreign aid in the future.

The first two objectives, those of military security and relief from distress, have been attained. The physical reconstruction stage of Greek recovery has proceeded well. But the effort to make Greece self-sustaining and independent of foreign aid, to develop a power program to establish new industries and to improve agriculture, has hardly begun.

This results partly from the tragic guerrilla war. But it should also be frankly recognized that an important reason for the delay has been a less than satisfactory performance by the Greek Government in its conduct of economic affairs. Only 27 months remain in which the Greek Government may take advantage of the American aid made available through the Marshall plan. This short time permits no further delay.

It seems to me self-evident that the Greek people are most anxious to improve their economic position, but that this can be accomplished only by increasing the productive capacity of the country.

THE FREE ELECTION

I believe that this desire for economic betterment was a paramount consideration of the Greek people when on March 5 they chose a new Parliament in free elections that won the respect of the entire democratic world.

The American representatives in Greece have scrupulously refrained from any attempt to influence either the outcome of the election or the formation of a new Government based on this fresh mandate of the people. The American people, however, are entitled to expect, and do expect, that any Greek Government which hopes to continue to receive the aid which they have generously offered, will utilize this assistance to the fullest degree.

In my opinion, only a stable and efficient government supported by the people and by Parliament will be able to act with the courage and the firmness of long-term policy which are essential to the wise use of the aid offered by the American people. Irresponsible talk of adjourning Parliament or of new elections before the new Parliament has had an opportunity to rise to its responsibility, can only create a climate of political and economic uncertainty which may do grave damage to the country's future.

The undertaking of a program of large-scale investment, which must necessarily be compressed into a short period of time, will present many problems which can be solved only by a Government which has a consistent policy and which is prepared to act with great courage.

Temporary sacrifices must be made for the sake of future benefits. Many of these sacrifices will be unpopular with local minorities, especially if the people are not convinced that the sacrifices are being equally shared.

If funds are to be available for financing an ambitious program of new electric power plants, new industries to provide employment, and the irrigation and improvement of the land, then rigorous economy in other Government expenditures will be essential.

It will be necessary to continue the planned reduction of the armed forces, to curtail subsidies, and to make many other savings. I am confident that if the issues are properly presented to the people, they will readily choose new opportunities for employment in preference to special privileges which can only result in continuing budget deficits. Nevertheless, these will not be easy decisions, and only a Government which can secure and maintain public confidence by its boldness and by its devotion to the public interest can be expected to execute the reconstruction stage of Greek recovery. We earnestly hope the Greek Government will meet this challenge.

BASIC ACTIONS NEEDED

The chief of the ECA mission to Greece and I are in complete accord that, pursuant to the obligations imposed upon by the Congress of the United States, we cannot conscientiously approve the commitment of American funds for contemplated new projects until the Greek Government has made basic and binding decisions which will assure the success of the purposes for which the funds are intended.

Foremost among these projects are those which contemplate the construction of four new electric power plants which would more than double the present generation of electricity in Greece and which would bring cheap electric power to many areas of Greece for the first time. The desirability of these new plants is beyond question. They are the keystone to the further industrial and agricultural development of Greece.

When Mr. Potter was recently in Washington, he received the approval of ECA headquarters for the allotment of American aid necessary to their construction, subject to the judgment of the American mission here as to the financial capacity of the Greek Government to embark on a program of this magnitude. The hard truth, however, is that while the dollars and other foreign exchange needed for the electric power program are available, the Greek Government at the present time does not have the drachmae to pay the local costs of construction. The drachmae which should be available for this purpose are presently required to meet the deficit in the Government budget which results from excessive spending.

Whether or not all or some of the contemplated power plants can be begun in time to take advantage of American aid is a matter that depends solely upon decisions to be made by the Greek Government and the Greek Parliament within the next few weeks. The decisions which need to be made are of two kinds. The first are those which relate to the adoption of an adequate financial plan which the Government will follow. The second are those which should result in a wide and far-reaching improvement in Government efficiency.

FINANCIAL PLAN URGED

An adequate financial plan should include measures which will sharply curtail Government spending on current account, including the armed forces, in order to provide funds for capital investment.

The financial plan should establish a ceiling on the debt which the Government may incur by borrowing from the Bank of Greece or by other means. No change in this debt ceiling should be possible without express authority of Parliament. Subsidies should be curtailed. Government enterprises, such as the state-owned railways which are a drain on the budget, and the Agricultural Bank which incurs a deficit in spite of excessive

charges to farmers for fertilizer and for loans, should be put on a self-supporting basis, while at the same time reducing costs to the users of their services.

The tax system should be simplified and rationalized, and taxes due should be fully collected, to the end that Government revenues will be increased, the investment of private capital will be encouraged and social justice will result from each citizen paying his fair share of taxes.

A major improvement in Government efficiency is essential to a proper administration of the aid which is offered. The improvement should include the establishment of a cabinet with a minimum of Government ministries, a greater decentralization of responsibility to nomarchs and the enactment of a civil-service code to replace the one recently declared invalid because it had not received parliamentary approval.

In order to foster self-help and local initiative, it is advisable that elections of local officials, which have not taken place for 14 years, should be considered for the very near future. To administer whatever electric power program that may be undertaken, a special agency should be established, independent of politics and with a tenure for its officials long enough to cover the period of construction and initial operation.

FOR PARLIAMENTARY APPROVAL

The foregoing measures, which we regard as essential to the successful fulfillment of a major capital investment program, should, it seems to me, be proposed by the Greek Government to the Parliament at the earliest possible date.

The Parliament, of course, may modify, enact, or reject all measures proposed to it, in accordance with what the deputies believe to be the will of the people. But we in the American missions regard parliamentary approval of major recovery measures to be essential, not only as a validation of the democratic process of government but as an assurance that the hard tasks of reconstruction have the willing support of the sovereign Greek people.

It is in the hands of the Greek Government and the Greek Parliament to decide whether or not they wish to continue to receive American aid and hence to accept the responsibilities which will attain its purpose. It is the obligation and intention of the American Government with regard to all Marshall-aid countries to decide whether or not the performance of the recipient Government, whether Greek or any other, justifies a continuance of the aid on the scale heretofore contemplated.

I trust that this clear statement of the American concern in the Greek recovery will receive the earnest consideration of the Greek people and their representatives and that decisions to proceed boldly with an ambitious reconstruction effort will be taken quickly by the new Parliament.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

GRADY.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on April 7, last, Secretary of State Acheson sent a strong note to the Korean Ambassador demanding action to halt inflation in Korea.

Mr. Acheson said in part:

The Secretary of State must inform His Excellency that unless the Korean Government is able to take satisfactory and effective measures to counter these inflationary forces, it will be necessary to reexamine, and perhaps to make adjustments in, the Economic Cooperation Administration's assistance program in Korea. . . .

Of equal concern to this Government are the reported intentions of the Korean Government, as proposed by the President of

the Republic of Korea in a message to the National Assembly on March 31, to postpone the general elections from the coming May until sometime in November. The Secretary of State wishes to draw to His Excellency's attention the fact that United States aid, both military and economic, to the Republic of Korea has been predicated upon the existence and growth of democratic institutions within the republic. Free, popular elections, in accordance with the constitution and other basic laws of the republic, are the foundation of those democratic institutions.

The holding of the elections as scheduled and provided for by the basic laws of the Republic appears to this Government as equally urgent with the taking of necessary measures for the countering of the inflationary forces already discussed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary of State Acheson's note be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the note was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON'S NOTE TO THE KOREAN AMBASSADOR REQUESTING ACTION TO HALT INFLATION IN KOREA

The Secretary of State wishes to take this opportunity to express to His Excellency the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea, prior to the latter's return to Seoul, the deep concern of this Government over the mounting inflation in Korea. The Secretary of State wishes His Excellency to convey to the President of the Republic of Korea the view of this Government that the communication of March 4, 1950, from the Korean Prime Minister to the chief of the economic cooperation mission in Korea, in which the view was expressed that there is no serious problem of inflation in Korea, but rather a threat of deflation, indicates a lack of comprehension on the part of the Korean Government of the seriousness of the problem and an unwillingness to take the drastic measures required to curb the growing inflation.

It is the judgment of this Government that the financial situation in Korea has already reached critical proportions, and that unless this progressive inflation is curbed in the near too distant future, it cannot but seriously impair Korea's ability to utilize effectively the economic assistance provided by the Economic Cooperation Administration.

BUDGET LIMITS IGNORED

Government expenditures have been vastly expanded by bank overdrafts without reference to limits set by an approved budget. Tax collections have not been increased, aid goods have been underpriced, and governmental subsidies have been expanded. The dangerous practice of voluntary contributions has been used as an inefficient substitute for a sound taxation system. These uneconomic practices have, in turn, served to expand the currency in circulation, unbalance the Korean national budget, and cause a sharp rise in wholesale and retail prices, thereby strengthening the growing forces of inflation.

The Secretary of State must inform His Excellency that unless the Korean Government is able to take satisfactory and effective measures to counter these inflationary forces, it will be necessary to reexamine, and perhaps to make adjustments in, the Economic Cooperation Administration's assistance program in Korea.

The Secretary of State wishes to inform His Excellency in this connection that the American Ambassador in Seoul is being recalled for consultation within the next few days regarding the critical problems arising out of the growing inflation in Korea.

ELECTION MOVE NOTED

Of equal concern to this Government are the reported intentions of the Korean Government, as proposed by the President of the Republic of Korea in a message to the National Assembly on March 31, to postpone the general elections from the coming May until sometime in November. The Secretary of State wishes to draw to His Excellency's attention the fact that United States aid, both military and economic, to the Republic of Korea has been predicated upon the existence and growth of democratic institutions within the Republic. Free popular elections, in accordance with the constitution and other basic laws of the Republic, are the foundation of those democratic institutions.

The holding of the elections as scheduled and provided for by the basic laws of the Republic appears to this Government as equally urgent with the taking of necessary measures for the countering of the inflationary forces already discussed.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I now wish to set forth what the American people are entitled to expect and do expect.

B. AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE ENTITLED TO EXPECT—AND DO EXPECT—THAT MARSHALL-PLAN GOVERNMENTS WILL UTILIZE ASSISTANCE TO THE FULLEST DEGREE

Mr. President, I do not condemn the actions of our Department of State in either the case of Greece or Korea. But, as the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] said the other day, it is difficult to square the position taken by the administration in objecting strenuously to having any restraints or restrictions written into the ECA Act by the Congress, on the ground that to do so might impinge upon the sovereignty of such nations, with its own actions in Greece and Korea in laying down the law—namely, that if certain things are not done by the countries, including the holding of elections, ECA funds will be withheld.

I agree with Ambassador Grady that—

The American people * * * are entitled to expect, and do expect, that any Greek government which hopes to continue to receive the aid which they have so generously offered will utilize this assistance to the fullest degree.

Mr. President, the American people are entitled to expect, and do expect, that the governments of any and all Marshall-plan countries which hope to continue to receive the aid they have offered will utilize this assistance to the fullest degree.

C. AMENDMENT WOULD PROTECT AMERICAN TAXPAYERS FROM FURTHER MISUSE OF THEIR GIFTS BY SOCIALISTIC GOVERNMENTS

Mr. Hoffman has admitted that Europe's experiments with socialism are slowing down recovery there. He has said, "Socialism will slow down the [production] process."

He has also expressed the belief that private enterprise will produce more for less and will serve the people better.

This is borne out by what has happened in Britain under Sir Stafford Cripps' democratic planning. As Winston Churchill put it:

Socialism, with its vast network of regulations and restrictions and its incompetent planning and purchasing by Whitehall officials, is proving itself every day to be a dangerous and costly fallacy.

Even the Socialists are beginning to wonder why it is that free-enterprise America should be able to produce so much while British workers have to depend upon American aid to maintain their standard of living nearly 5 years after the end of the war.

The answer is not difficult. Another member of Parliament has summed it up as follows:

Working for a great central machine has never appealed to people, and it is unlikely to do so. State monopoly brings into being a machine so cumbersome that it cannot be controlled. The machine becomes the master. When industrial organizations are taken off the rails of private enterprise and bereft of their motivating forces of competition and profit, all sense of purpose and direction appears to be lost.

The whole conception of state ownership and control is a feeble attempt to meet a twentieth-century problem with an outmoded nineteenth-century remedy.

As a Socialist government nationalizes more and more industries, the ratio of government bureaucrats to productive workers steadily increases. These administrative parasites only serve to add to the general frustration and disillusionment among the workers in the industries.

The nationalized coal industry of Great Britain is a good example. Since it was socialized in 1947, 6,000 workers have been added to the administrative, non-productive staff, an increase of 27 percent. Output per miner has decreased 6.2 percent. Absenteeism has doubled, and strikes have tripled, as compared with prewar.

The deficit for 1947 and 1948 of the nationalized coal industry amounted to \$86,800,000 as compared with a prewar—1938—profit of \$54,000,000 under private ownership and operation.

Mr. Hoffman has stated that he has a clear duty to protest any Government action that in any way slows down recovery.

The amendment now being considered would protect the American taxpayer from the use of American dollars by Socialist governments in a way that is "slowing down recovery" in Europe.

V. CAN EUROPE AFFORD ANYTHING BUT FREE ENTERPRISE?

Mr. President, recently William Henry Chamberlin, noted writer and editor, returned from a 3 months' visit to Europe, where he went to study conditions on the spot.

Mr. Chamberlin, in an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post, reported:

It is a pet idea of leftist advanced thinkers on both sides of the Atlantic that Europe, being poor, cannot "afford" free enterprise. That sort of thing, the argument runs, is a luxury possible for rich America. Poor countries can make both ends meet only by employing hordes of bureaucrats to think out new ways of putting production into strait-jackets.

There is one contradiction in this theory which these advanced thinkers never explain. How does it happen that free, or capitalist, America with its supposedly wasteful system not only maintains the world's highest standard of living for its own people but contrives to subsidize the scientific collectivist economies of Europe?

Is it just possible that freedom offers some of the decisive answers in economics as well as in politics?

Mr. Chamberlin then said:

I found visible prosperity in proportion to the degree of freedom from state control.

Belgium is exhibit A for this proposition. Of all the nations involved in the war, Belgium has given the freest rein to the profit motive. Rationing is a distant unhappy memory; taxes are moderate; there is a minimum of planning.

The missing dynamo in the British industrial machine is the absence of incentives to work hard and efficiently. Everyone is assured an extremely low, sub-WPA standard of living through full, or overfull, employment, cradle-to-grave "security," and subsidies to keep down the prices of rationed foodstuffs. But because of the back-breaking taxes and the thousand restrictions on private initiative, no one has much inducement to rise above this low average.

Moreover, the ECA effort to promote closer economic union is foundering on the rock of Socialist planned economy.

That closer union in which farsighted Europeans of all nationalities see the salvation of the old continent can only be a union of free economies. The question is not whether Europe can afford free enterprise. The question is whether it can afford anything else.

VI. IT IS UNWISE TO ENCOURAGE UNIFICATION OF EUROPE'S SOCIALISTIC, PLANNED ECONOMIES

Mr. President, we are told that one of the objectives of the Marshall plan is to encourage the economic unification of Europe. If this is one of the objectives, very little progress has been made thus far. To date Mr. Hoffman has made very little progress on this score. However, he has made it known that he intends to take vigorous steps to further economic integration in the months ahead.

The question arises, will it be to the best interests of European recovery, will it be to the best interests of our American economy, to encourage the integration of the socialistic, planned economies which exist in so many of the Marshall-plan countries? Is it wise to encourage the unification of the cartels and monopolies which now exist in individual countries into giant European cartels and monopolies? I, myself, cannot help but have grave doubts in regard to the wisdom of such a course. In that event, instead of having one great government cartel engaged in the iron and steel industry in Great Britain, would it not be possible that a giant cartel would cover all of western Europe, and that the American producers of iron and steel and the American workers engaged in those industries would be in competition with such a cartel and with workers employed under such conditions?

One of Europe's foremost economists, Dr. Wilhelm Roepke, now associated with the Graduate Institute of International Studies at the University of Geneva, Switzerland, has said:

It is a bit of irony that the Marshall plan, which should have pulled western Europe out of the muck of collectivistic nationalistic economic policy, has threatened to create a new collectivism on a superstate level. The way things are today, everything seems to indicate that the Marshall plan will achieve the exact opposite to what most of its American creators and clear-seeing Europeans had originally expected.

That is not the loose talk of an idle thinker. Those are the words of one of the greatest economists of Europe, a man with a world-wide reputation, who must weigh his words before he speaks.

VII. UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION CREATED BY MARSHALL PLAN HAS NOW RETURNED TO PLAGUE US

When the proposal to adopt the Marshall plan first came before the Senate early in 1948, this question was raised during the course of the debate:

Assuming that the 16 recipient countries are able to increase production sufficiently to meet the requirements of the plan, will there be world markets for the contemplated exports?

It was stated further at that time:

In order for her exports to balance her imports by 1952, it is necessary for western Europe to expand her export volume far above prewar levels, due to reduced foreign investments, higher prices of imports, and increased population.

There seems little possibility that western Europe can find markets for the industrial products she will have to offer.

Mr. President, we are told that industrial production in western Europe is now well above the prewar level. According to ECA Administrator Hoffman, "industrial production has not merely been lifted to the prewar level, but stands 20 percent above it."

But, in spite of this increase in production the so-called dollar-gap problem is still with us. Our American taxpayers are told they must contribute approximately \$3,000,000,000 to bridge this gap between western Europe's imports and her exports.

One factor contributing heavily to the continuation of the dollar gap, in spite of nearly \$10,000,000,000 of Marshall-plan aid already extended, is the lack of markets for the products being turned out by western Europe's factories. So now western Europe, with the blessing of the Administration, has begun dumping her products on the American market.

A. UNDER THE HOFFMAN PLAN, THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WILL PAY TILL IT HURTS—AND THEN KEEP ON PAYING

ECA Administrator Hoffman, in his statement on February 21, 1950, before a joint meeting of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, said: "We must sell less to and buy more from Europe." He wants American producers to give up part of their overseas business and forfeit part of their markets here at home to foreign producers.

Mr. Hoffman admitted that this new competition would create problems. Some American industries would be driven out of business, a large number of American workers would be thrown out of work. And how does Mr. Hoffman propose to meet this situation? He said: "If there must be some relief in this situation, I suggest that it be given directly." He apparently wants our taxpayers to subsidize American industries paralyzed by foreign competition—competition which has been brought into being and built up by the dollars that the same American taxpayers sent abroad in the form of foreign aid.

Under the Hoffman plan the American people will pay until it hurts—and will then keep on paying after it hurts.

B. COMPETITION WITH SOCIALISTIC CARTELS AND MONOPOLIES IS UNFAIR COMPETITION

The most distressing aspect of this situation is the fact that much of the competition which is being built up by American dollars is unfair competition. American businessmen and workmen pride themselves on being able to meet fair competition, anywhere, any time. They have been able to do so in the past, and they can do it now. All they ask is an even break.

But competition with the vast socialistic monopolies and cartels being built up with Marshall-plan dollars is not fair competition. These government-owned and operated industries have definite advantages when competing with private industry. They do not have to pay taxes. Their government owner stands ready to subsidize their losses, and they have a monopoly of their home markets. These advantages enable them to carry on dumping operations in other countries, including the United States.

This unfair foreign competition, built up by dollars taken from the American taxpayers, has already caused a great many American workers to lose their jobs.

According to the Bureau of the Census, there are now more than 3,500,000 American workers unemployed. The Department of Labor of the State of Missouri told me recently that during the 5-month period ending March 1, last, more than 160,000 workers in Missouri filed unemployment insurance claims for the first time.

Mr. President, I shall not undertake to review any great number of American industries with the idea of examining the effect of what is going on upon their prosperity, but I shall refer to two or three of them.

C. THE WATCH-AND-CLOCK INDUSTRY

The American watch-and-clock-making industry has been hit particularly hard by unfair foreign competition. The distressing case of Waltham Watch, now closed down, is all too familiar. Waltham Watch "went under" despite a loan of some \$6,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As a result of the closing of the Waltham plant, some 1,200 skilled workers were thrown out of employment.

While this is happening in this country, ECA is helping to develop Britain's watch-and-clock industry.

I wonder whether the workers of the Waltham Watch Co. who have been thrown out of employment happen to have seen the January 1950 issue of the British magazine Soundings, which contains this statement:

MARSHALL AID IS PROVIDING NEW JOBS FOR BRITISH WORKERS

The ECA has granted to the General Time Instruments Corp., of New York City, a \$1,000,000 currency convertibility guaranty to cover the operations of its British subsidiary, Westclox, Ltd.

Westclox has set up a new plant in the Strathleven Industrial Estates, near Glasgow. The Marshall plan is developing the United Kingdom's watch-and-clock industry

and creating jobs in one of Scotland's economic problem areas. Strathleven has been converted from a country estate into a government-sponsored development scheme to draw light industries into an area dominated by the heavy engineering, coal mining, and shipbuilding industries centers on the Clyde River. These have created periodic unemployment problems in the past and do not give opportunities for workers with special light-industry skill.

Westclox now employs some 250 persons, who can make 400,000 clocks a year. Plans are being made for watch production, and by 1951 the plant will have 350 workers running out an estimated 500,000 "alarum" clocks and 50,000 pocket watches annually.

Westclox is helping to break new economic ground in Britain. Before the war the U. K. imported most of its watches and clocks, many of them from the American and Canadian plants of General Time Corp.

Mr. President, I emphasize the sentence:

Before the war the United Kingdom imported most of its watches and clocks, many of them from the American and Canadian plants of General Time Corp.

The quotation continues:

But the new Scottish plant is already producing more than the parent company used to send to Britain.

Here we have a specific example of watch-making companies going bankrupt here at home while American people are furnishing aid to build up similar industries in Britain, whose products are rapidly taking over the market which our producers formerly enjoyed.

Furthermore, the British Socialist Government is giving direct subsidies to its watch-and-clock industry. According to the January 16, 1950, issue of Foreign Commerce Weekly, an official Department of Commerce publication, subsidies paid by the British Socialist Government to the watch-and-clock industry during the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1949, were as follows: \$310,000 in 1946-47, \$730,000 in 1947-48, and \$590,000 in 1948-49.

The British Socialist Government, it so happens, is placing great emphasis on increasing exports of timepieces. According to our Department of Commerce, each British manufacturer is assigned an individual export quota, and is allocated scarce materials in ratio to his success in meeting his quota. To meet foreign competition and achieve export goals, some manufacturers have reduced export prices below cost.

The Department of Commerce admits that this competition is likely to be felt by the United States clock industry.

Here is additional enlightening information:

An agreement was signed March 12, 1946, under which the Swiss . . . agreed to make available, on a rental basis and under certain conditions, the special machines which the British needed. . . . The Swiss also agreed to furnish to the British jewel bearings and certain watch parts. The British established acceptable import quotas for Swiss watches and movements at increased maximum prices.

Wages paid workers in the British watch industry average 30 cents an hour. A considerable number of youths are employed at a starting wage of 22 cents an hour. These rates are less than half

those paid to American workers. Of course, British workers are able to make a living on these lower wages because costs of food are lower in Britain than in America, due to the food subsidies made possible by Marshall-plan aid.

Here, then, is what American watch and clock producers are up against:

First. Under the Marshall plan, aid is being extended to rehabilitate and expand the watch-and-clock industry in Britain.

Second. The British Socialist Government is making generous, direct subsidies to the watch industry there, so that manufacturers are able to reduce export prices below cost. These subsidies are made possible by Marshall-plan aid.

Third. The British have a discriminatory bilateral agreement with Switzerland relative to production and imports of watches and parts.

Fourth. The British workers receive less than half the wages paid American workers, which greatly aids the British manufacturer to turn out a low-cost instrument. The British Socialist Government, in turn, subsidizes food costs. These subsidies, too, are made possible by Marshall-plan aid.

Is it any wonder, then, that the British are so rapidly taking over markets formerly belonging to American producers?

D. THE BICYCLE INDUSTRY

Recently a representative of our bicycle industry told me that unfair foreign competition—largely from Great Britain—threatened to drive his industry out of business.

The American bicycle industry is particularly vulnerable to British competition. The British Socialist Government, I am informed, grants special benefits and subsidies to the bicycle industry there, all to the end that they may ship British bicycles into our markets at prices which are below the actual cost of production of American bicycles.

Foreign manufacturers, with far greater production, lower labor rates, and various types of subsidies have practically preempted all foreign markets. Now they are moving in on the American domestic market.

On January 16, 1949, F. E. Ahern, attaché at the American Embassy in London, submitted a report to the Department of State on British bicycle production. This report quotes Mr. George Wilson, managing director of Raleigh Industries, Ltd., one of the largest British manufacturers of bicycles as saying:

Reduction in our prices in the United States resulted in a substantial increase in orders to our Boston plant. This means doubling our business in America during the coming year.

American bicycle manufacturers have no desire to exclude foreign bicycles from the United States market. They are demanding that they be permitted to compete for this business on a fair basis and not with products subsidized by foreign governments and further supported by grants of money from our own Treasury.

E. THE LUMBER INDUSTRY

Dant & Russell, Inc., an important lumber firm operating in Washington and Oregon, recently wrote me saying:

The way ECA is operating means that we are financing the business of every country in the world except the United States. Every year more of our people are becoming unemployed while the countries we are helping have full employment.

F. THE AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY

Let us refer briefly to the aircraft industry for another example of how American dollars are being used to build up unfair competition abroad.

The ECA program authorization for aircraft engines and parts for the period April 3, 1948, through February 28, 1950, is shown on a table which I have here. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ECA procurement authorization for aircraft, engines, and parts for the period April 3, 1948, through February 28, 1950, reads as follows:

France	\$37,600,000
Italy	4,500,000
Netherlands	28,700,000
Belgium-Luxemburg	2,900,000
Greece	900,000
Denmark	800,000
Norway	900,000
Sweden	500,000
Total	76,800,000

Mr. KEM. Each of the countries receiving these gifts of aircraft, many of them of the latest type, in addition to engines and other parts, has a government-owned air-line monopoly.

These air lines are all nationalized, and are competing directly with American industry.

I have previously called to the Senate's attention the fact that American Airlines, Inc., decided to dispose of its interest in an American overseas operation because of difficulty in securing risk capital on reasonable terms. While this is going on, its direct competitor, the British Government, is being financed by the ECA.

G. THE JOB OF EVERY AMERICAN WORKER IS JEOPARDIZED BY GROWTH OF DOLLAR-BUILT SOCIALIST CARTELS ABROAD

Mr. President, these are only a few of many similar examples that could be cited. They are conclusive evidence that unfair competition from abroad gravely threatens our American economy. Unfortunately, the worst is yet to come, unless the Congress acts.

As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, the Socialist Government of Britain is scheduled to take over the iron and steel industry only 8 months from now. Nearly half of Britain's exports are largely based on steel. If the steel industry is turned into a vast Government-owned monopoly, it will be a giant sword of Damocles over the American economy. The British Socialist Government will be in a position to dump products on American foreign and domestic markets on an unprecedented scale, drive more of our industries out of business, and throw more millions of American workers out of employment. Unless the Congress decides otherwise, all this will be done at the expense of the American taxpayers.

The use of American dollars to finance experiments in socialism abroad affects

the well-being of both the people of America and the people of the countries we are trying to aid.

The job of every American worker is jeopardized by Socialist cartels abroad. I cannot justify paying heavily for the privilege.

I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 621. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton;

S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins;

S. 2853. An act to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2874. An act to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect;

S. 3117. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 3, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 621. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton;

S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins;

S. 2853. An act to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2874. An act to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect;

S. 3117. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and

S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

Mr. DONNELL rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator from Missouri rise?

Mr. DONNELL. To ask recognition to speak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state by title the pending business.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, had not the senior Senator from Missouri been recognized before the Senator from Texas rose?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas gave notice that at the close of the remarks of the junior Senator from Missouri he would ask for the regular order.

The senior Senator from Missouri is now recognized.

INVESTIGATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I rise at this point in opposition to the amendment in the nature of a substitute presented by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to Senate Resolution 202. I understand, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Texas has called for the regular order, but I also understand that it is within my rights for me to speak upon such subject as I shall choose, and I choose to speak, as I have indicated, in opposition to the amendment presented by the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I have just asked that the Senator from Tennessee be informed of the fact that I am speaking.

As I stated earlier today, I am in favor of the adoption of Senate resolution 202 as it was reported by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and as supplemented by report of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with two amendments to be incorporated therein.

The amendments to which I refer are the deletion, on line 18, on page 2, of the comma and the words and figures "but not later than July 31, 1950," and on line 2, page 3, to strike out the figure "\$50,000" and incorporate in lieu thereof the figure "\$100,000."

Mr. President, in order that we may intelligently consider the resolution which I favor and the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from Tennessee, which I oppose, it will be necessary to consider something of the respective contents of each of the two resolutions, namely, Senate Resolution 202, and the substitute which constitutes the amendment presented by the junior Senator from Tennessee, whom I am pleased to see now upon the floor.

Senate Resolution 202 provides at its outset that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make full and complete study and investigation of the subject matter which is thereafter set forth in the resolution. It will be observed, Mr. President, that under Senate Resolution 202 it is either the entire Committee on the Judiciary, which consists of 13 Members of the

Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof which is authorized and directed to make the study and investigation to which reference has been made. There is no restriction as to the number of persons who shall constitute the subcommittee in the event that it shall be a subcommittee, rather than the entire committee, which shall make the study and investigation authorized by the resolution. It is entirely possible that the subcommittee could consist of 3, 5, 7, 9, or any other number of members, equal to or less than the entire membership of 13 of the Committee on the Judiciary. The substitute presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee, in place of authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make the study and investigation, provides for the appointment of a special committee composed of five members, to be appointed by the President of the Senate from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary. It is to be noted, Mr. President, that there is in the substitute a limitation on the number of members of the special committee, the limitation being five, no more and no less.

Although the substitute provides that the special committee shall be appointed from two of the committees of the Senate, namely, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary, there is no provision in the substitute which designates how many of the members shall be from either of those committees. It is entirely possible, at least theoretically, for four of the members to be from one committee and one member to be from the other committee, although I assume that in all reasonable probability the membership would be taken, three from one committee and two from the other committee. Obviously, members from one of the two committees would predominate on the special committee, and would therefore constitute a majority. At the time the Senate votes in favor of the substitute, if it shall so vote, no Member of the Senate, unless he were given special information which is not now available generally, would have the slightest knowledge as to which of the two standing committees would contribute the majority of the special committee. Thus it is that if Members of the Senate should sustain by their votes the amendment submitted by the junior Senator from Tennessee, we would have to wait until after our decision is made to ascertain from the lips of the Vice President who shall be chosen and which committee of the two standing committees shall contribute a majority of the members of the special committee.

Mr. President, it is to be observed also, as an essential difference between the two resolutions, namely, Senate Resolution 202 on the one hand, and the substitute submitted by the junior Senator from Tennessee on the other hand, that, in the first instance, under the resolution reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules and Administration, it is a standing committee of the Senate, or a subcommittee of such standing committee, to which is delegated the duty reposed by the terms

of Senate Resolution 202. On the other hand, the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the junior Senator from Tennessee provides not for a standing committee of the Senate, neither the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce nor the Committee on the Judiciary, to be the body by which the study and investigation shall be made, but, instead, provides for a special committee. That is the language of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Yesterday afternoon a brief statement was made by the Senator from Tennessee as to the history of Senate Resolution 202. I should like very briefly to recapitulate the legislative history to this point both of that resolution and of Senate Resolution 249, to which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee also referred yesterday afternoon. Those are the two resolutions which were considered by the Senator from Tennessee as being substantially to the same effect as to the scope of the investigation and the study which should be made. Therefore, I think it is of some importance to consider the legislative history to this point of each of the two resolutions and also to consider whether there is any reason for the fear expressed by the Senator from Tennessee that if one of these resolutions should be adopted there will necessarily or reasonably likely follow a duplication, with two investigations of substantially the same scope in operation at the same time. I may say, as I indicated last evening, that I do not believe it follows at all that if Senate Resolution 202 shall be adopted by the Senate there is any danger whatsoever of a rival or duplicatory investigation being carried out under the terms of Senate Resolution 249. My reasons were briefly indicated yesterday, and I shall in a few moments have something further to say with respect to those reasons.

Senate Resolution 202, which I shall for the purpose of brevity from time to time refer to as the "Judiciary Committee resolution," was submitted to the Senate by the Senator from Tennessee on January 5, 1950, and was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on the same day.

As the Senator from Tennessee said yesterday, a subcommittee, consisting, as I recall, of five members of the Committee on the Judiciary, was selected for the purpose of giving attention to the Judiciary Committee resolution and reporting back to the full committee with respect thereto. It was the privilege of the Senator who now addresses the Senate to be one of the members of that subcommittee, and to have observed with much interest and cordial appreciation the fine spirit of public service evidenced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, who served as the chairman of the subcommittee. I think it is fair to say that conscientious and, I trust, at least reasonably capable efforts were bestowed by the subcommittee on the consideration of the Judiciary Committee resolution.

We were assisted also by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary himself, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I observe with interest and pleasure that the junior Senator from

Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is now occupying the chair, I judge by the expression on his face, concurs in my statement that the distinguished Senator from Nevada did render very substantial assistance in the preparation of the final form of the Judiciary Committee resolution.

On February 27, 1950, the Judiciary Committee resolution was reported by the Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and was then referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The reason for the reference to the latter committee was the fact that it was provided in the Judiciary Committee resolution that for the purpose of the resolution the committee was authorized to employ certain assistance, and that the expenses of the committee under the resolution, which it declared should not exceed \$100,000, should be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee. Thus, it was that on February 27, 1950, the Committee on Rules and Administration was charged with the responsibility of giving consideration to the terms of the Judiciary Committee resolution.

As the Senator from Tennessee recalled to the attention of the Senate yesterday afternoon, the Committee on Rules and Administration held a hearing, on which occasion there were present several members of the Committee on the Judiciary, notably the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], besides one or two other Senators whom I do not recall, and the chairman of the committee. It was also the privilege of the present speaker to be present at that meeting. That was the meeting at which the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] set forth the views which he had with respect to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce over the subject matter which was embraced within the Judiciary Committee resolution.

Following the hearing before the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Judiciary Committee resolution was, on March 23, 1950, reported by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, with the additional amendments to which reference has been made by the Senator from Tennessee, namely, the incorporation at line 18, on page 2, of the words, the punctuation and the figures, "but not later than July 31, 1950," which, as the context will disclose, is the date fixed by the resolution as so amended by the Committee on Rules and Administration not later than which it should be the duty of the Committee on the Judiciary to report to the Senate its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation.

The second of the amendments inserted by the Committee on Rules and Administration was a reduction from the \$100,000 figure for expenses to the figure of \$50,000, which had been the initial figure carried in the Judiciary Committee resolution at the time of its submission by the Senator from Tennessee.

We were favored yesterday by a statement by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] as to the circumstances surrounding the change in the figure and the circumstances with reference to the attitude, the very kindly attitude, the very courteous attitude, of the Committee on Rules and Administration with respect to the resolution.

Therefore, on March 23, the Committee on Rules and Administration having thus completed its duties, the Judiciary Committee resolution came to the table of the Senate, if I may term it such, for further consideration by the Senate, and became a part of the calendar of the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the legislative history of Senate Resolution 249, which was submitted on April 4, 1950, by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is, and was then, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It will be observed that it was not until approximately 11 days after the Judiciary Committee resolution had been reported to the Senate that Senate Resolution 249 was submitted to the Senate and came before it in any manner, shape, or form. On the very next day, April 5, 1950, Senate Resolution 249 was reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which it had been referred on the preceding day, and was reported without amendment, and thereupon was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, it will be observed that the report by the Senator from Colorado and the reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration of Senate Resolution 249 was 3 months, less 1 day, after the Judiciary Committee resolution had been submitted to the Senate and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Yet we find Senate Resolution 249 immediately referred, on April 5, to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. President, there are two other measures to which brief reference should be made, and at least to one of which, and possibly to both, reference was made yesterday by the Senator from Tennessee. I refer to Senate bill 3357, which is a bill to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce. This bill, S. 3357, was itself not introduced until April 4, 1950.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for 5 minutes?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President—

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may yield to me for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall be compelled to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEFAUVER in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I had just referred to S. 3357, which was introduced in the Senate by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] by request on April 4, 1950, which was some 12 days after the Committee on the Judiciary resolution had been reported to the

Senate by a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Thus it was that S. 3357 did not come into the Senate until approximately 3 months, I think lacking possibly 1 day, after the submission of Senate Resolution 202. We find, however, that on April 12, 1950, S. 3357 was reported by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Senate, and placed upon the calendar of this body, and that 1 week later, April 19, 1950, upon the call of the Consent Calendar, the bill (S. 3357) was passed by the Senate.

The second bill to which reference is made, in addition to the resolutions to which reference has already been had, is S. 3358, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Colorado by request, and referred on the same day, April 4, 1950, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Although, Mr. President, no action has ever been taken by the Senate itself as to S. 3358, other than to refer the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on April 11, 1950, 7 days after the introduction of S. 3357, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce decided to begin hearings on April 17 on said bill S. 3358. The first witness who was heard at the hearings to which reference has been made was the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, our former colleague, Attorney General McGrath, and he was to be, and I presume was, followed by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Crime Division, as well as by other witnesses, and from day to day thereafter, at least a portion of the time, hearings proceeded with respect to S. 3358, although until this present moment no action—I think I am correct in stating this—has been taken by the Senate itself as to S. 3358 other than the reference to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. President, there was presented to the Democratic policy committee of the Senate what was considered to be the problem caused by the pendency of Senate Resolution 202, the Committee on the Judiciary resolution, and Senate Resolution 249, the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Colorado. The Democratic policy committee gave consideration to the question and to the general subject, I assume, of the proper phraseology of a resolution designed to solve the problem which was so presented.

It is my understanding from the press that there was considered by the Democratic policy committee of the Senate an amendment in the nature of a substitute to solve this problem, and, as I understood yesterday from the Senator from Tennessee in his address to the Senate, the problem which confronted the Democratic policy committee of the Senate was the alleged likelihood of two parallel hearings, practically duplicates one of the other, proceeding unless some such solution were arrived at, namely, a proceeding under Senate Resolution 202, the Committee on the Judiciary resolution, and a proceeding under Senate Resolution 249, which I may term the Johnson resolution, which had been

pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as previously indicated.

From the Washington Post of April 13 I understand that the substitute which has been proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee was a compromise offered by the majority leader and accepted on April 11 by the Democratic policy committee. I have in my hand the Evening Star of April 11 of this year, which also contains an item in the course of one of its articles reading as follows:

The Senate Democratic policy committee decided this afternoon to set up a special five-man committee for a thorough investigation of interstate crime syndicates, Chairman Lucas announced. This would avoid the duplication of two separate inquiries, one by the Judiciary Committee and the other by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. President, what does the substitute proposed by the junior Senator from Tennessee do? In the first place it substitutes, as has previously been noted, in place of a standing committee of the United States Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, a special committee of five members to be appointed by the President of the Senate from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

I have previously noted the fact that there is no requirement as to how many members shall be from each of those standing committees, and that an appointment of four from one of them and one from the other would meet the requirements of the substitute. I have stated, however, my assumption that the President of the Senate would probably select from one of those standing committees three, and from the other two, of the members of the special committee.

I want to emphasize, Mr. President, two facts to which I have already made reference, but which I think will bear repetition and which should be emphasized. First, that the membership of the special committee, cannot, by virtue of the odd number, the number of five, be equal from each of the two standing committees. Therefore, a majority of the members of the special committee will come from either the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Committee on the Judiciary, and therefore the members from one or the other of the two said standing committees will be in the minority on the special committee.

Second, that if the Senate creates a special committee, not a single Member of the Senate, unless possessed of some information not known to the entire Senate, will, when the vote creating the special committee is announced, know which of the two committees, namely, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Committee on the Judiciary, will be the one which shall furnish the majority of members of the special committee. It is entirely conceivable, Mr. President, that some Members of the Senate might desire to have such knowledge. They might feel that

the subject matter is peculiarly one as to which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for illustration, should have the majority, or, conversely, that the subject matter is such that the Committee on the Judiciary should have the majority. But in voting upon the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee all of us are in the dark as to which of the two standing committees will furnish the majority of the members of the special committee.

I am opposed, Mr. President, to the creation of a special committee. The first of my reasons for being opposed to the creation of a special committee is that there is no need to bypass the standing committees of the Senate by authorizing the employment of a special committee.

Press reports indicate that it has been asserted that adoption of the Kefauver substitute is needed in order that there may not be a duplication resulting from the making of two separate investigations, one by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the other by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

A few moments ago I read from the Washington Evening Star, in which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] is stated to have announced that the setting up of a special five-man committee would avoid the duplication caused by having two separate inquiries, one by the Judiciary Committee and the other by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That newspaper account illustrates very clearly the reports which have appeared in the press in regard to the reason for the proposal to create a special committee.

Mr. President, the argument that adoption of the Kefauver substitute is needed in order that there may not be a duplication resulting from having two separate investigations made, one by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the other by the Committee on the Judiciary, is not well founded. The reason why it is not well founded is that Senate Resolution 249, the Johnson resolution, which provides for an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has not been adopted by the Senate, and no hearings under that resolution have been authorized by the Senate. There is no compulsion upon the Senate to permit two separate investigations to occur, if the Kefauver substitute is not adopted. The Senate is not obligated to permit the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an investigation. The Senate has a right to authorize its Judiciary Committee to be the only committee to conduct the investigation. Likewise the Senate has a right to authorize its Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to be the only committee to conduct the investigation. Certainly the ability of the members of either of those standing committees is such that either one of them could conduct the investigation and study.

Of course, Mr. President, my association has been somewhat closer with the members of the Judiciary Committee than with some of the members, at any

rate, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Therefore it is with no derogation to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that I assert that, without any question, the Committee on the Judiciary, headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, is able to conduct the investigation. I assert with equal certainty that it is true that until the Senate authorizes the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make an investigation under Senate Resolution 249, there will not be two duplicate or separate investigations in process, one under Senate Resolution 202 by the Judiciary Committee and the other under Senate Resolution 249.

Mr. President, the Senate need not be apprehensive that unless the Kefauver substitute, providing for the appointment of a special committee is adopted, two duplicate investigations—one under Senate Resolution 202 and the other under Senate Resolution 249—will be in process. The Senate has this matter entirely within its control. Until such time as the Senate approves Senate Resolution 249, no investigation can be entered upon by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under that resolution.

However, Mr. President, it is curious and interesting to note, on the other hand, that even if the Kefauver substitute, providing for the appointment of a special committee is adopted, it still will be entirely possible that its investigations will be paralleled by hearings conducted by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under Senate bill 3358, which pertains to the transmission of certain gambling information, on which resolution, as has been previously stated. Although the resolution has not been adopted by the Senate, hearings began on April 17, with the Attorney General of the United States being the first witness.

Thus it is, first, that the adoption of the Kefauver substitute, providing for the appointment of a special committee, is not necessary in order to prevent the making of separate, duplicate investigations under Senate Resolution 202 and Senate Resolution 249; and, second, even if the Kefauver substitute is adopted and even though the special committee to be appointed thereunder makes an investigation, there is nothing to prevent an additional investigation, namely, an investigation under Senate bill 3358, from also being carried on simultaneously with the investigation which the special committee constituted under the Kefauver substitute would be carrying on.

Mr. President, in connection with the consideration by the Senate of the first point of opposition which I make to the proposal to appoint a special committee, namely, the reason that there is no need—and by my voice I emphasize the word "need"—to bypass a standing committee through the authorization of the appointment of a special committee, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the appropriate standing committee, whichever it may be, whether the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is by the terms of the Legislative

Reorganization Act of 1946 fully empowered and eminently able to do all that is needed to be done in the premises.

I need not remind the Senator from Tennessee, who occupies the chair in this body at this moment, of the great care which was devoted to the preparation of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I personally can remember, as do all other Members of the Senate, I am sure, who were in the Senate at that time, the fine work which was done by former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, whose name is one of the two names by which the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is currently known—the La Follette-Monroney Act of that year.

I have stated that the appropriate standing committee, whichever it may be, is by the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 fully empowered and eminently able to do all that is needed to be done in the premises with respect to the investigation and study which are proposed to be made of the crime situation.

At this point let me quote from the remarks of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], when speaking in the Senate on January 15, 1947. Let me add that at that time he was quoting the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], my esteemed seat mate in the Senate; and the remarks of the Senator from Oregon were also quoted in this very body on the 20th of February of this year by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I read now from page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1947, volume 93, part 1:

The jurisdiction of the standing committees has been so comprehensively described in the reformed rules as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation.

I have at hand a copy of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and, as bearing upon the powers of standing committees, created I should say by that instrument, and as to the type of membership of the staffs of such standing committees, I call attention to section 202, at page 26 of the printed copy of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, in which section each standing committee is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs, and I quote the words "on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

So, Mr. President, a standing committee, either the Judiciary Committee or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, is provided presumably with staff members, of qualifications, appointed on a permanent basis and without regard to political affiliations and "solely," to quote the Legislative Reorganization Act, "on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

As bearing further on the question whether there is any need to bypass the standing committees of the Senate through the appointment of a special committee, I also call to the attention of the Senate the provision at page 23 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, namely, the Legislative Reorganization Act, section 134 (a), which sets

forth the powers of each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee. The importance of the reference to "subcommittee" is that, should Senate Resolution 202, the Judiciary Committee resolution, be adopted, it might be that, instead of the entire Committee on the Judiciary, a duly authorized subcommittee thereof might function.

What are the powers of the standing committees and of the subcommittees of any such committee, under section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946? I read:

Each standing committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions—

Yes; but I pause there. Someone might say, up to that point, such committee could not act in recess; but the framers of the Legislative Reorganization Act thought of that. I continue to read after the word "sessions": "recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate."

In other words, they have power—

to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of \$10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable.

I pause at that point to indicate, as I have done previously, that under the terms of Senate Resolution 202, the Judiciary Committee resolution, the \$10,000 figure, of course, will be superseded by the figure which the Senate in its wisdom may cause to be finally placed in the resolution, \$50,000, \$100,000, \$150,000, or whatever it may be.

Then there is a very interesting direct statement in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which bears directly on the question of making investigations; and what is that provision? It reads:

Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words.

The concluding sentence of the subsection reads:

The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. President, obviously there is no reason to bypass either of the two standing committees. I want to make it clear, if I may, at this point, that I am not advocating that both of the standing committees should be empowered to make this investigation. I see no reason for both of them to do it, and, as the members of the Judiciary Committee who appeared before the Rules and Administration Committee argued, it was entirely proper that the Judiciary Committee should make the investigation. But, aside from that, obviously there is no need to bypass either of these two standing committees of the Senate, because of any lack of adequate power on

the part of such standing committee or committees to handle the investigation.

In this connection, attention is invited to the following observation, on January 15, 1947, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, at page 343, by the very distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], whom I do not see in the Senate this afternoon, but who was here earlier today. Reading:

Therefore the argument that it is necessary to have special committees in order that authority to subpoena witnesses may be conferred is not sound, since such authority has now been given to the standing committees.

I call attention to this strong, vigorous sentence from our able and distinguished friend, who is so keen and alert, as he always is in the performance of his duties in the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Maryland. Said he:

That is an additional reason why no special committee should be created by the Congress.

Mr. President, remember the fact that the Kefauver substitute abandons this theory of the senior Senator from Maryland and undertakes to, and if adopted will, create a special committee, according to the exact words of the Kefauver substitute. But the Senator from Maryland, as I say, after indicating the fact that it is unnecessary to have special committees in order that authority to subpoena witnesses may be conferred, says, "That is an additional reason why no special committee should be created by the Congress."

The distinguished Senator from Maryland, however, did not stop with the observation to which I have referred and which I have quoted. Speaking further on January 15, 1947, at page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, he said:

But the question again comes down to this—and I shall not now argue it—that there is absolutely nothing, and in fact almost minus nothing, if that is possible, which a special committee purports to do that the standing committees are not authorized to do, equipped to do, and can do—

And I emphasize this, Mr. President—and can do a great deal better than the special committee.

Mr. President, I have already referred to the fact that there is an express provision in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, reading as follows:

Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction.

Attention is invited to another provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act, namely, section 136, appearing at pages 23 and 24 of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, which reads as follows:

Legislative oversight—

That is the heading—

Legislative oversight by standing committees.

Then the section reads as follows:

To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as

it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee, and for that purpose shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, I quote again from the senior Senator from Utah, speaking on January 15, 1947, and doing honor, as he did, to the junior Senator from Oregon by quoting from remarks previously made by the latter Senator on January 13, 1947, at page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, as follows:

Second, the standing committees of the Senate have been authorized by the Legislative Reorganization Act to exercise continuous oversight of the execution of the laws by the administrative agencies within their respective jurisdictions. They are being equipped with professional staffs and expert investigators to assist them in performing their oversight function and have been armed with the subpoena power for this purpose. Hereafter the investigatory function of Congress should be performed—

I emphasize the words from here on—should be performed by its standing committees which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose, instead of relying upon special investigating committees which are sporadic in nature and cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations.

So, Mr. President, for the reasons and by virtue of the facts set forth in what I have presented, I submit that my objection to the Kefauver substitute resolution, namely, that there is no need to bypass standing committees, is sound.

This is not the only reason, Mr. President, which the Senator now speaking has for opposing the creation of the special committee which is contemplated by and provided for in the Kefauver substitute for Senate Resolution 202.

The second of my reasons for opposing the creation of the special committee is that it is not only unnecessary to bypass standing committees, but that the creation of the special committee violates the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It will be recalled that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 apportions among the standing committees the various subjects of legislation, and, to quote from the junior Senator from Oregon—I shall indicate to the reporter in a moment where the quotation starts—to create a special committee, quoting from the Senator from Oregon, "is to trespass on the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee."

Senators who may be interested in finding this quotation will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93 part 1, at page 344.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Utah on January 15, 1947, quoting further from the junior Senator from Oregon, said:

First, the jurisdiction of the standing committees has been so comprehensively described in the reformed rules as to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. Thus, to create a special committee is to trespass upon the assigned jurisdiction of some standing committee.

It may be suggested to the Senate that the Legislative Reorganization Act, as it passed the Senate originally, before it went to the House of Representatives for concurrence, contained a section which was not in the bill as it came back from the House and, consequently, not in the Act as it was finally passed by the Senate. The section to which I refer is section 126, which reads as follows:

No bill or resolution, and no amendment to any bill or resolution, to establish or to continue a special or select committee, including a joint committee, shall be received or considered in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

It may be argued, Mr. President, that the fact that the Senate had adopted section 126 but subsequently accepted the LaFollette-Monroney bill, the Legislative Reorganization Act, without this section in it, indicates a departure by the Senate from its previous position in opposition to the establishment or continuance of special or select committees; but, this point was ably considered by the senior Senator from Utah in his remarks of January 15, 1947. I again quote from his remarks at page 343 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1. Said he:

During the Senate debate on the bill a few Senators, including Senator Mead and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], questioned the desirability of section 126 which imposed a ban on the future establishment of special or select committees, but their doubts on this score appeared to be set at rest by Senator LaFollette's assurance, first, that the jurisdiction of the reorganized standing committees had been so comprehensively described in the bill as to cover every conceivable subject of legislative concern, and, second, the possible reminder that the Senate can always expand the jurisdiction of a standing committee to embrace some unanticipated problem, or suspend its rules by a two-thirds vote and establish a special committee to deal with a normal subject. With this assurance, opposition to this provision evaporated, and the Senate approved the entire measure by a 3-to-1 vote.

Mr. President, on the same date, January 15, 1947, the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], now the honored minority leader in the Senate, speaking at page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, said this:

There is no dispute over what the Senate did, but the law which was passed did not contain the provision outlawing special committees. It is my opinion, as I think the distinguished Senator from Utah will agree as he reviews the history of what happened in the joint committee, that the main reason the House did not go along with that provision was the mechanical reason I have given relative to the procedure of standing committees. The practice which is still in vogue in the House is to create special committees, cutting across the standing committees to give such special committees the subpoena power, and not to give it to the standing committees. It is not now given by the House to standing committees.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that the power of subpoena, so far as I have observed in the Legislative Reorganization Act, is not today given to the standing committees of the House of Representatives under the provisions of

the act, but is, as I have previously indicated, by reading section 134 (a), distinctly and unequivocally given to the standing committees of the Senate.

The distinguished senior Senator from Utah, speaking on January 15, 1947, said this:

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The fact that the subpoena power is given to the Senate standing committees merely proves that in our minds we were thinking of making the standing committees powerful and enabling them to go into any field that might be desirable. One of the sections that was eliminated from the reorganization bill while it lay on the Speaker's table in the other House was section 126, which banned special committees. What the motives of the House leaders were in thus emasculating or denuding the Senate-approved bill in such a fashion I have no idea, but the effect of their action was to deny the membership of the entire House of Representatives an opportunity to express their will with respect to the proposed ban, as well as with respect to other stricken sections.

Therefore it was not the House of Representatives but a few leaders thereof who are responsible for the amputation of the reform bill and for the deletion of the ban on special investigating committees.

Thus amended, the reorganization measure came back to the Senate on July 26 for our consideration. The Senate sponsors of the bill were anxious to restore, as affecting the Senate at least, the provisions which had been stricken on the House side, including the ban on special committees, but it was too late in the session to risk sending the bill to conference. Members of the House were leaving town in large numbers, and there was grave danger that the conference report would fall of acceptance in the other body because of the absence of a quorum.

In order to salvage what was left of the original bill, former Senator La Follette moved that the Senate concur in the House amendments, and the Senate so concurred, but in so moving and acting neither former Senator La Follette nor the other Senate members of the joint committee, nor the Senate itself, yielded their original conviction as to the desirability of prohibiting the establishment of special committees in the future.

It is an erroneous interpretation of what happened on that occasion to say that in the Legislative Reorganization Act Congress expressly refused to abolish special committees. We yielded to a parliamentary situation. We have not changed our minds.

Mr. President, as previously indicated, section 134 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1943 contains the power of subpoena for the Senate standing committees. There is no such power for the House standing committees. This fact indicates that, notwithstanding the noninclusion of section 126, the Senate gives the subpoena powers to the standing committees, thus obviating the necessity of creating such committees with such subpoena powers.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to certain observations made in past years by distinguished Members of the Senate which bear upon the question of special committees and the attitude of the Senate with respect thereto. I quote first from the distinguished former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, speaking on June 6, 1946, during the debate preceding the passage of the Reorganization Act, which, incidentally, was approved finally on August 2, 1946. I quote the following from what he said at

pages 6365 and 6366 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5:

Nevertheless I am sure that all Senators appreciate that, if this work is done by the standing committees, it is a much more efficient way of transacting business, because no matter how well the select or special committee may do its work, whatever legislative recommendations flow from the studies or investigations made by select or special committees must in the end be referred to the standing committees of the Senate. Often, because there is no cross-reference between the standing committee in a particular province of legislation and a select committee created for a special purpose, it becomes necessary for the standing committee, to some extent at least, to replot the ground which has been gone over by the select committee or the special committee.

Furthermore the work of select or special committees is of necessity sporadic. They are created for a special purpose, with a special objective in mind, for a certain field of investigation or study. When that need has passed they tend ultimately to be abandoned, and for that reason their effectiveness is sporadic in character; whereas, if it now becomes the responsibility, as we propose, of the standing committees of the Senate to carry on this very important oversight function, we feel that it will result in a much more continuous surveillance of the executive agencies and departments of government.

Mr. President, I quote from the observations made by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], speaking on June 6, 1946, at page 6366 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5:

Mr. HILL. Anent what the Senator from Maine has said, I think there are many very wise, constructive, and fine features in this reorganization bill; but I doubt if there is any feature that commends itself more than this very feature involving the abolition of special committees. As the Senator from Maine knows and has stated, the creation of special committees has meant a great deal of dispersion of effort, and much duplication and waste of time and effort on the part of Senators. The regular legislative committees alone can report proposed legislation to cure ills or defects which may exist; and yet we find numerous special committees taking numberless hours of the time of Members of this body to investigate, investigate, investigate, though they have no power to report remedial or other measures.

The Senator and his committee certainly have pointed out a most important and needed reform, in my opinion, in connection with the work and procedure of this body, namely, to do away with the special committees, and to impose responsibility and the authority directly on the regular legislative committees.

Again, Mr. President, I quote from the distinguished former Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, at page 6394 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5:

The committee came to the conclusion that if we could reorganize the committees, and staff them adequately, it would be in the interest of orderly and efficient legislative procedure to have the standing committees or subcommittees thereof conduct studies and investigations, because, after all, if legislation is to flow from these activities, normally the select or joint committees do not have legislative power, and it is often necessary for the standing committee to thrash over much of the straw and the wheat that has been thrashed over by a special or select joint committee, as the case may be.

I pause at this point to mention the fact that although it is provided in the Kefauver substitute that "the committee shall report to the Senate the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable," I assume that no one would question the statement that after the recommendations have been embodied in the requisite bills, they would still have to be referred back to the appropriate standing committee or committees of the Senate for further consideration, thus involving not only the consideration by the special committee created by the Kefauver substitute, but also by the standing committee or committees to which reference of such measures had occurred.

Finally, Mr. President, with respect to the former Senator from Wisconsin, let me point out that on June 6, 1946, at page 6371 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5, referring to the power of the suspension of rules to cover extraordinary situations, he said:

However, if in the future some very extraordinary matter arises, such as the control of atomic energy, as to which it might be felt that there was a need for the creation of such a committee, or if we were, unfortunately, to be engaged in a war, I have no doubt that a matter of such transcendent importance would cause a sufficient number of Senators to vote to suspend the rule.

The distinguished majority leader of the Senate, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], has himself given much thought and consideration to this very important question as to whether special committees should or should not be created. The senior Senator from Illinois gave such consideration even before the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed.

I refer to his remarks on April 1, 1946, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 3, page 2876, reading as follows:

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator from Nebraska has said, I should like to make one further comment on what occurred before our committee this morning dealing with the termination of all special committees.

It was agreed by members of the Mead committee that they were of the opinion that they could finish their work by January 1 of next year. It was also agreed by the Kilgore committee, for which a resolution is now on the calendar, that they could finish their work and terminate the committee by January 1 next. It was also agreed that the committee set up under the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would also be terminated at that time.

In other words, there is a feeling among members of these special committees—and I am very happy to report it—that sooner or later, and the sooner the better, so far as our committee is concerned, the special committees will terminate and finally find their way back into standing committees, where a subcommittee, or the full standing committee, can take care of the kind of work formerly handled by a special committee.

Then, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois concluded this particular portion of his utterance by saying—and I call special attention to this language:

Mr. President, I merely wished to mention that fact, because I am satisfied that it is

the feeling of the Senate as a whole that standing committees should perform the work of these special committees in 90 percent of the cases, and the sooner we return to the fundamentals which have existed in the Senate so far as standing committees are concerned, the better it will be for the United States Senate.

The observations, the very sound, very well-considered, and, to my mind, very wise observations, on the part of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois thus indicated clearly his view in opposition to the advisability of the creation of special committees, and indicated it even before the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois did not cease to give thought to this important question after the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that almost 6 months after the approval of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which, as previously indicated, occurred on August 2, 1946, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois addressed the Senate on January 20, 1947, his remarks being set forth at page 451 of the RECORD, volume 93, part 1, in a debate on the continuation of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, Senate Resolution 46.

Before quoting the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I am sure we would all agree that a special committee on the investigation of the national defense program certainly would be one of the outstandingly important committees, and that the observations of the Senator from Illinois with respect to a committee having such important functions are of especial consequence and moment. The Senator from Illinois said on January 20, 1947:

Every Senator knows—

"Every Senator knows"—

that if we follow the spirit and the letter of the Reorganization Act there is no place for this particular special committee to continue its investigation.

Speaking on the same day, as reported on page 453, volume 93, part 1, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Senator from Illinois made these observations:

Mr. President, the reduction of the number of committees and limitation of membership on committees is an absolute necessity if the committee system is to work efficiently. The crux of the La Follette-Monroney Act—

I pause, Mr. President, so the record may be made clear that that is the Legislative Reorganization Act—

The crux of the La Follette-Monroney Act is in those provisions limiting the number of committees and defining the jurisdiction of all the committees created under the Reorganization Act. Here is something that has never been tried before. It is the keystone—

Listen to the language, Members of the Senate, of the Senator from Illinois—

It is the keystone in the arch of congressional reform. It is also the complete answer to those who seek—

I want every Senator here—and I am sorry there are not more here—to re-

member this strong statement by our distinguished friend the majority leader—

It is also the complete answer to those who seek to undermine the foundation stones of this legislative act by insisting that special committees be appointed. The very reason we spelled out in the Reorganization Act the jurisdiction of each and every committee was that special committees were being eliminated. Therefore, when an investigation was called for, we specified by which committee it should be conducted.

Mr. President, obviously the Senator from Illinois considered not only that the provisions limiting the number of committees, defining the jurisdiction of the committees, were the keystone, as he said, in the arch of congressional reform, but that those who insist that special committees be appointed "seek"—to quote his picturesque language—"to undermine the foundation stones of this legislative act." This is the Senator from Illinois speaking on January 20, 1947.

Mr. President, I call attention also to this significant language by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois on the same day, January 20, 1947, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, at page 453:

Anyone who says that by creating the special committee now proposed we shall not be violating the letter of the law, as well as its spirit, simply does not know what he is talking about, because in connection with each and every one of the standing committees established under the Reorganization Act the jurisdiction of each committee is clearly spelled out, word for word, and as a result of designating clearly the jurisdiction of the 15 standing committees, anything under God's high heaven can be investigated. In my opinion, if new committees are created, both the spirit and the letter of the Reorganization Act will be violated.

I think the language of the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Illinois, that as a result of designating clearly the jurisdiction of the 15 standing committees "anything under God's high heaven can be investigated," is certainly sufficiently broad to cover the investigation proposed in the Ke-fauver resolution or in the resolution of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. President, again on December 31, 1948, almost 2 years later than the observations thus quoted from the senior Senator from Illinois, he had this to say to the Senate, as it appears on page 10257, volume 94, part 8 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that I shall not object to the resolution which has been submitted for continuation of the committee for a period of 30 days, in order that the committee may make its report during that time. However, Members of the Senate well know the position of the great majority—

I wish there were some way I could emphasize that statement, Mr. President, by my voice. The Senator from Illinois said:

The Members of the Senate well know the position of the great majority of Democratic Members with respect to special committees under the Reorganization Act. No Senator is more interested in the continued success of small business than is the Senator from Illinois. However, a vital principle dealing with special committees is involved under

the Reorganization Act, and it seems to me that at the proper time either the Banking and Currency Committee or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should take over the duties of the Small Business Committee. One of the regular standing committees should continue to operate in behalf of the small business of this Nation. As everyone knows, I feel very keenly about the matter, as was apparent from the spirited debates we had on this subject 2 years ago when the matter was before us at that time. I shall reserve further remarks upon the question until some more appropriate time.

Mr. President, in this year, 1950, to wit on February 20 of this year, the Senate was the recipient of a most interesting address by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], whom I have known for many years. I knew him when he was the distinguished chief executive of his State, as was the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] of his State. The junior Senator from Florida, speaking in the present Congress on February 20, 1950, had these significant observations to make:

Mr. President, I do not care to go over the same ground that I covered Friday afternoon in my argument on this subject. However, there are two points which I think need to be accentuated at this stage of the argument, the first of which is to remind Senators—and I wish more Senators were present in the Senate Chamber at this time—

I pause to say that this subject matter must contain some strange allergy to keep the Senators away, because the Senator from Florida seems not to have had a very large attendance at the time of the delivery of his address. He continued:

that this matter was very fully and ably argued to a conclusion, at least for the time being, in 1947, in the Eightieth Congress, and that the splendid arguments against the setting up of any special committee on small business, as then suggested by Senate Resolution 20, are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that time, and it seems to me they still very clearly express a conviction on the part of the Democratic majority of this Congress, then the minority of the Eightieth Congress, against the creation of any special committee on small business or any other special committee, as being in contravention of the spirit of the Reorganization Act, and also as not being in accord with the best interests of sound, economical, efficient, and democratic government, here in the Halls of Congress.

Continuing, the distinguished Senator from Florida said:

I have been impressed today while re-reading the arguments presented in the 1947 debate, and I wish time permitted me to read a larger portion of them into the RECORD at this point.

I wish to comment that able Senators who are still Members of the Senate took very strong positions against the adoption of the then pending measure, Senate Resolution 20, which was intended to reestablish a special committee on small business. The argument of the able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was very compelling on this point. The argument of the able senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was one of the best I have ever heard him make. The two arguments made by the able senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are full of good meat, and they lead one to the very definite conclusion that it was against the interests of sound and well-organized

legislative government to trespass against the spirit of the Reorganization Act by the adoption of a measure to set up a special committee on small business.

The able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] argued the matter with great ability and distinction.

The able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], although he now takes a different position, at that time—as shown by his participation in the argument on several occasions—was strongly of the feeling that the special committee should not be reconstituted or set up again.

The then serving minority leader, Mr. BARKLEY, now the President of the Senate—

I pause to call attention to the fact that he is also the Vice President of the United States—

likewise argued this question exhaustively at that time, and I shall quote briefly from his argument before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, in the course of the remarks so made by the Senator from Florida, he referred to the two arguments made by the senior Senator from Maryland. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that that is the same Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] who made the observations which have previously been referred to, namely—

Therefore the argument that it is necessary to have special committees in order that authority to subpoena witnesses may be conferred is not sound, since such authority has now been given to the standing committees. That is an additional reason why no special committee should be created by the Congress.

Again, he said:

But the question again comes down to this—and I shall not now argue it—that there is absolutely nothing, and in fact almost minus nothing, if that is possible which a special committee purports to do that the standing committees are not authorized to do, equipped to do, and can do a great deal better than the special committee.

On January 15, 1947, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] said this, in quoting the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] as appears on page 344 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1:

Hereafter the investigatory function of Congress should be performed by its standing committees which have been empowered and equipped for the purpose, instead of relying upon special investigating committees which are sporadic in nature and cannot introduce legislation to give effect to their recommendations.

Mr. President, referring again to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], let me say that he was quoted as follows by the Senator from Florida on February 20, 1950, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1933.

Then we shall eliminate the duplication of effort, waste of time, and waste of manpower which was unavoidable under the system which existed when we had special investigating committees.

Further, Mr. President, let me say that the following colloquy appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 20, 1950, at page 1940.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend, I have only a few minutes. After the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed, the Senator

from Illinois tried to live up to the letter and spirit of the act, by voting against special committees. The Reorganization Act is plain on that score; it outlaws special committees. But the Reorganization Act has been violated many times since then.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not disagree with what the Senator has said up to this point. But the Legislative Reorganization Act does not outlaw special committees.

Mr. LUCAS. I was under the impression it did. I still think it did. I took that position at the time. But, anyway—

The junior Senator from Florida made this further statement, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 20, 1950, at page 1933.

Mr. President, not only was this the position taken by the distinguished leaders on this side of the aisle, but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the votes were taken on this measure, it appeared that all but three Members among the Democrats in the Senate at that time voted to stand by their then leader, the then distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky; and also by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, the whip at that time; and that with three exceptions, on both yea-and-nay votes taken on that legislation, first upon the so-called Tobey amendment, and, second, on the adoption of the resolution, there were only three Democrats then sitting in the Senate who did not go with the leadership and with the other leading Democrats, who had voiced their extreme disapproval of the custom and practice of setting up special committees, and of the efficiency of such a system. I may say those three include the senior Senator from Montana, who is consistent in his continued opposition on the floor of the Senate. He is the only one who has been consistent, I may say, and I think, in passing, we should all compliment him upon his consistency. The other two brethren among the Democrats who joined him in 1947 are no longer on the floor of the Senate. They were the then Senator from Texas, Mr. O'Daniel, and the then Senator from Tennessee, Mr. Stewart. So that the only Senator now serving as a Democrat who then took that position is the distinguished Senator from Montana, who quite consistently maintains his position; which, however, flew in the face of the party's position taken by his leadership, and followed by nearly all members of the Democratic minority.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, on January 24, 1947, even voted against Senate Resolution 20, the small business special committee resolution.

So, Mr. President, I submit that not only is there no need to bypass the standing committees of the Senate—and that is the first point of my opposition—but, in addition, there are profound reasons—as we may determine by studying the history of the La Follette-Monroney Legislative Reorganization Act and the provisions of that act, and in view of the qualifications of the standing committees and their staffs—for the superiority of the views so vigorously asserted on those previous occasions by the Senator from Illinois, as compared to the view which now apparently is asserted by him in connection with the Kefauver resolution, which was reported as a result of the action of the Democratic policy committee.

Mr. President, a third reason which I have for opposing the proposed creation of a special committee is that the special committee will not be subject to the discipline under which a standing committee would operate or to the oversight and superintendence to which a subcommittee of a standing committee would be subject. Obviously, if a special committee is appointed consisting of five Members of the Senate, it is not a part of any other committee. It is true that some of its members are drawn from one committee, and one or more of its members are drawn from another committee, but there is no committee which has any jurisdiction by way of discipline or oversight or supervision with respect to the action which shall be taken by the special committee. The special committee would be sailing a sea in a ship of its own, without any supervision whatever or control from any of the regular committees.

Contrast that, Mr. President, with the situation in one of the standing committees. I know that in the Judiciary Committee we hold hearings ordinarily once a week, or sometimes not quite so frequently, sometimes every 2 or 3 weeks; at other times, several times in 1 week. The distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee sits upon the floor this afternoon in the absence of the chairman—who is in the West on an important mission of that committee, I may say—and he can testify, I am sure, as can also my distinguished friend from Tennessee, the author of the Kefauver resolution, who is a very capable and distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee himself, as to the fact that, week after week and month after month, the subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee are subject to its jurisdiction, to its oversight, to frequent questioning as to progress which is being made, and sometimes even to what might amount to censure, sometimes to compliment, but certainly at all times, to the independent oversight not only by the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who has rendered great service to the committee, but by the committee as a whole; and this very fine quality, this very fine fact with respect to subcommittees of a standing committee would not exist in the case of a special committee.

Mr. President, I shall group three other objections which I have to the creation of the special committee, and I want to say in fairness that they are taken verbatim from the language already used by my distinguished friend and seat mate, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If I am not mistaken, they were adopted likewise by the Senator from Utah in quoting from my friend from Oregon. I quote these fourth, fifth, and sixth of my reasons for opposing the creation of the special committee, taken from the statement made on January 13, 1947, by the Senator from Oregon, as follows:

The reformed Senate rules limit Senators to service on two standing committees each so that they can meet their legislative responsibilities more effectively. If, in addition,

Senators are appointed to serve on special committees, the burdens of committee work will be correspondingly multiplied and the old evils of poor attendance and scattered attention will return.

Creation of one or two special committees now will pave the way for the establishment of a rash of special committees with inevitable duplication of the work of the standing committees and unnecessary large-scale expenditures. It might also lead to a revival of the use of staff personnel borrowed from downtown departments with all the disadvantages of that practice.

Creation of special committees to deal with subjects already assigned to standing committees will also be a burden to, and impair the efficiency of, the executive agencies of the Government by requiring their officials to repeat their testimony on the same subjects before several committees of the Senate.

Mr. President, I think I am correct in the statement I am about to make. If I am not, I hope some Senator will be kind enough to correct me. It is my understanding that the only select or special committees the Senate now has are two; one, the Special Committee on the Reconstruction of the Senate Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of the Senate Chamber—and I am pleased to note that my esteemed colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri, is one of the Senators who has served upon that special committee—second, the Special Senate Committee on Small Business, under the terms of Senate Resolution 58, members of which committee were appointed on April 10, 1950. Someone may say, "Well, there are committees on atomic energy and on printing." But I call attention to the fact that while there is a committee on printing and a committee on atomic energy, each of the two last committees are joint committees, whose membership consists of Members of both Houses of the Congress. So, Mr. President, at this time, unless I am mistaken, the Senate has been very scrupulous in following the rule of not creating special committees, and only for some special, outstanding reason are they created.

We have had references here in some of the quoted observations of the Senator from Illinois as to the number of times the Senate has violated the Legislative Reorganization Act. In the first place, one violation of it, so far as I can see, does not afford any basis for future violations of it, and, in the second place, my memory fails to recall a great abundance of violations of the Legislative Reorganization Act. But the fact remains that, regardless of whether there have or have not been violations, there are, today so far as I know, only the two special existing committees of the Senate, which I have mentioned.

Mr. President, someone may raise the question—and it would be a very appropriate one—whether the Senator who is now addressing the Senate himself voted for the creation of the Special Committee on Small Business. I want to say that he did so vote. I think it was proper that he should, and I am quite sure that if the situation were to arise again he would do so again.

Mr. President, in the first place, it will be recalled, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 1943, of February

20, 1950, that under the terms of the so-called Wherry resolution (S. Res. 58) a select committee was created with the following provision as to its duty:

It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises.

A resolution was offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], in 1947, to the effect that "the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey, by means of research, all the problems of American small-business enterprises." The Senator who is now speaking voted against the resolution so presented by the Senator from New Hampshire, and for Senate Resolution 20, the so-called Wherry resolution, which authorized a special committee of 12 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, to study, and so forth, all the problems of American small business enterprises.

Obviously, there are sound reasons for voting to create a committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business. The very content of its duty, namely, "to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small-business enterprises," indicates the vastness of the scope of the committee which should consider that subject. Obviously, there is no one committee of the Senate which has, and there are no two committees which have, legislative jurisdiction of all the problems of American small-business enterprises. For illustration, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has jurisdiction over the inspection of livestock and meat products, and over the dairy industry. The Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction over financial aid to commerce and industry, with one specific exception; it has jurisdiction over the control of prices of commodities and services. The Committee on Finance has jurisdiction over revenue measures, tariffs, and national social security. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has jurisdiction over interstate commerce, and communications by telegraph, telephone, and radio. The Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction over the protection of trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has jurisdiction, among other things, over wages and hours of labor.

Obviously, all these subjects to which I have referred, over which these half a dozen committees of the Senate have jurisdiction, are included within the term "all the problems of American small-business enterprises."

Mr. President, it is entirely appropriate, to my mind, that a committee to study all—and I emphasize the word "all"—the problems of American small-business enterprises be not one of the standing committees, but shall be a special committee.

In the case of the Kefauver resolution, however, there is no such diversity of

subject matter as exists in the case of all the problems of small business. The subject matter of the Kefauver resolution is the single one of the utilization of facilities or their operation in interstate commerce, in furtherance of illegal transactions and the results thereof, including the development of corrupting influences in violation of law. Therefore, Mr. President, there is no such argument in favor of the creation of a special committee in the case of the subject matter of the Kefauver resolution as there is in the case of the study of all the problems of American small-business enterprises, which problems go into subject matters over which at least half a dozen of the committees of the Senate, which I have mentioned, have jurisdiction.

Mr. President, there is a further reason for just opposition to which such a committee, selected as provided in the Kefauver resolution, is subject, and that further reason is the conflict of tendencies between the members who are selected, at least in part, because of their membership on two committees with diverse jurisdiction. There are Senators from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee who have given years of service in the Senate to the particular and peculiar problems of that committee, and there are Senators, on the other hand, from the Judiciary Committee who have given years of service to the problems of that committee, with obviously entirely different tendencies. Members selected from each such respective standing committee are obviously apt to be inclined to direct the investigation primarily along lines to which the committee from which they emanate customarily devotes its attention. For example, if the members selected from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee should be in the majority, there would be a strong tendency for the special committee to emphasize primarily the phases of commerce, communication by telegraph, telephone, or radio, rather than to emphasize primarily the study of crime.

I take it that no one among us can have the slightest question that although there are some matters relevant to interstate commerce involved in this study, the primary thing which is involved in the proposed study is crime. The very substitute resolution of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee states that the special committee is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the laws of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and so forth, and so forth, including the question, Mr. President, whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the laws of the United States or of the laws of any State.

There can be no question that the predominant thought in the Kefauver resolution is the subject of the investigation of the activities of organized crime. It is true that the mention of interstate commerce exists in the resolution, and it is perfectly clear to every Member of the Senate why it is placed in the resolution. It is because of the fact that the Senate and the House of Representatives have no jurisdiction over crime as such in the State of West Virginia or in the State of Michigan or in the State of Missouri. Those are local matters, unless there is some basis of Federal jurisdiction, Federal interference in Federal matters. The transmission of information and the transmission of machines which are capable of illegal use are matters which are within the interstate commerce powers of the Federal Government. But to say that this resolution can have anything as its primary object other than the study of the activities of organized crime is to overlook the entire basis on which the resolution proceeds.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has himself done a most excellent job, assisted by one of the members of the staff of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Green, to whom I pay tribute at this moment—I think I see him in the Chamber at this time—for placing in the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary illustrations which emphasize the importance of the investigation of crime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a copy, first, of the report of the Judiciary Committee to the Senate with respect to Senate Resolution 202; and second, a copy of the report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration with respect to Senate Resolution 202.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

MR. DONNELL. Mr. President, the plan here proposed by the Senator from Tennessee is not his initial thought, because in his initial thought he had in mind the Judiciary Committee. He submitted a resolution in that form to the Senate and it was referred to the Judiciary Committee. He served as the chairman of a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and he approved and advocated the resolution which gives this function to the Judiciary Committee or a subcommittee thereof. But influenced, undoubtedly, by good motives—I have no question of his entire integrity of motive—influenced by the fact that the Democratic policy committee, for some reason best known to itself, has undertaken to bring forward a resolution to combine in this hybrid type of treatment members from two committees, for the committee is to be composed, if the resolution be adopted, of members not only of the Judiciary Committee, but of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, I fear, repetitiously, this afternoon, there is no assurance at all as to which of the two committees, the Committee on the

Judiciary, or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, will furnish the greater number of members of the special committee if it shall be authorized. Suppose it shall develop that three of the members of the special committee shall be derived from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Is there any question of doubt that there will be a strong tendency for the special committee to emphasize primarily the phases of commerce, communication by telegraph, telephone, and radio, rather than to emphasize primarily the study of crime?

Mr. President, there sits in the Senate this afternoon a Senator who is peculiarly qualified to serve upon a committee of this type. I hope he will take no offense at my having something to say with respect to his peculiar qualifications, his outstanding qualifications.

I should like to read at this point the contents of an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of April 13, 1950, which was just 2 days after the action of the Democratic policy committee, after a lengthy meeting, recommended this combination special 5-man committee, to which the Senator from Illinois referred. I quote from the editorial entitled, "Crime Probe," published in the Washington Post on April 13, 1950:

CRIME PROBE

It is now apparent that the Senate made a serious mistake in assigning the administration's two crime bills to the Interstate Commerce Committee. To be sure, they involve control of the instrumentalities of interstate commerce for the suppression of crime. But general legislation dealing with crime usually goes to the Judiciary Committee, and the present situation is clearly one demanding a thorough investigation into criminal activity of Nation-wide concern. In other words, the conflict of jurisdiction between the committees ought to have been resolved, in our opinion, in favor of the Judiciary Committee, which proposes to do a thorough and comprehensive job.

The compromise offered by Majority Leader LUCAS and accepted on Tuesday by the Democratic policy committee is unfortunate for a number of reasons.

This is not the Senator from Missouri speaking. This is a quotation from the Washington Post. I continue reading:

It would set up a special committee with members drawn from both Judiciary and Interstate Commerce. The effect would be a division of responsibility, loss of discipline over the committee, and creation of a new precedent for special investigatory units contrary to the sound policy followed in recent years of keeping investigations within the standing committees. The ease with which this reform appears to have been abandoned by the senatorial leadership is certain to be disillusioning to those who are seeking further improvement of congressional machinery.

Vice President BARKLEY has been given a free hand in selection of the proposed five-man special committee. Presumably this means that the committee will be headed by Senator KEFAUVER, who has sponsored an investigation of the comprehensive type. That is all to the good. Senator KEFAUVER is as able as he is fearless and, in addition, the country has reason to be confident of his sincerity in seeking a thorough investigation.

I ask Senators to listen to what follows in this editorial, which was published in the Washington Post 2 days after the

action taken by the Democratic policy committee:

But it is also assumed that this turn of events will keep Senator FERGUSON off the committee, and this seems to us a grave mistake. We have often disagreed with Senator FERGUSON, but we recognize that he is one of the most persistent, thorough, and relentless investigators in the Senate. His special training in this field entitles him to a place on the committee; and if he should be excluded, the committee would begin its work under a suspicion that the Senate is afraid to expose a complete picture of interstate criminal operations.

If this task is worth doing, it is worth doing well. Even a suspicion of whitewash in drawing up the resolution or in selecting the personnel would be a serious disservice to the cause of exposing and suppressing criminal gangs.

That is the observation made by the editorial in the Washington Post, and it refers to the possibility of the Senator from Michigan being left off the committee. Of course there can be no assurance, if the Committee on the Judiciary has charge of the investigation, that the Senator from Michigan will be on the committee. That would be a matter for the determination, I presume, in the first place, of the chairman of the committee, but certainly subject, I assume, to the approval of the entire Committee on the Judiciary. Nor is it at all certain that the distinguished Vice President would fail to appoint the Senator from Michigan on the committee. Obviously, however, what pervades the public mind generally is along the line indicated in this editorial: "This turn of events will keep Senator FERGUSON off the committee." I think the public would agree with the editorial writer in saying: "This seems to us a grave mistake."

I had the pleasure of reading Mr. David Lawrence's column published in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, April 12, 1950, and I should like to quote a portion of it at this point. The article was published the day after the action taken by the Democratic Policy Committee. Mr. Lawrence points out what is apt to be felt, whether truthfully or untruthfully, whether correctly or incorrectly, by the people of the Nation if the so-called Kefauver substitute should be adopted. I read from his column, as follows:

BEHIND-SCENE MOVES COULD CAUSE POLITICAL CRIME PROBE SCANDAL—BIG CITY MACHINES SEEN TRYING TO DELAY INQUIRY ON INTERSTATE RACKETEERING

(By David Lawrence)

Strange things are happening behind the scenes in the Democratic Party in Congress which may have a bearing on what could prove to be the worst political scandal in a generation.

Who is trying to squelch the congressional investigation of gambling and interstate rackets? What are the Democratic machines in the big cities trying to do to limit the inquiry, to delay it, and possibly to frustrate a thorough investigation of the tie-up between party politics in America and the worst vice rings that this country has encountered since the black days of the prohibition era?

The maneuvering in Congress as to what kind of investigating committee should be appointed, who shall sit on it and what its scope shall be looks very suspicious.

Why, for instance, has the Democratic Party, in a formal conference of its policy

members, decided to violate the precedent which was established when the La Follette-Monroney law was passed specifying that, when investigations are voted, they must be conducted not by special committees but by the regular committees charged with drafting legislation developed by an inquiry?

POSITION REVERSED

For many months now the Democratic leaders in Congress have fought against special committees and argued that the regular committees must do the investigating. Now this position has been reversed. Ignoring the demands of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which logically should conduct the investigation of crime—

Note that, Mr. President—

Ignoring the demands of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which logically should conduct the investigation of crime, a resolution has been decided on by the administration leaders which would limit the committee to only five members. Three of these would be Democrats. They would not necessarily be selected from the Judiciary Committee but would be appointed by Vice President BARKLEY, which means that the appointments are bound to be political.

The test will be what Republicans will be permitted to sit on the special committee if it is ever appointed—for it looks as if there is a concerted movement afoot to delay the inquiry's start so that it cannot gather much information prior to the congressional elections this autumn.

Mr. President, let me read one more sentence from this article:

Why is it that, in a matter of crime and law violation, anybody in the Senate should try to fix so early a date as July 31 as the day on which the investigation must be concluded?

Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] gave us the answer to that yesterday when he pointed out that this report is intended to be only a partial report of the committee.

What are the Democratic leaders afraid of? Do they fear that the investigation will probe too deeply into the big rackets in New York, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and the major centers of crime in America today?

And so forth and so on, from Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. President, these indicate something of what the public feeling is apt to be if in the instant case we shall violate the well-established rule, established not only by the La Follette-Monroney law, the Legislative Reorganization Act, but established by sound reason, proclaimed by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois himself before the La Follette-Monroney Act was passed, as I quoted him this afternoon, that the regular standing committees of the Senate should handle matters of this type.

Mr. President, I read yesterday afternoon this observation from Newsweek, which is a well-known publication, referring, as it does, to Senate Resolution 202. It says:

STRATEGY

What worried the Democrats was the possibility that FERGUSON's experience would make him the strongest man on the subcommittee. Since most big city political machines are controlled by Democrats, the fear grew that the subcommittee's findings could well be used against the administration in the coming crucial election.

When 2 weeks ago, Senator Ed JOHNSON, chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, introduced two antigambling bills, the worried Democrats found a way out of their dilemma. Ostensibly to reconcile the clashing jurisdictions of the two committees, the Democratic policy group last week decided on a five-man special committee—three Democrats and two Republicans—to be appointed by Vice President ALBEN BARKLEY. In this way, less able Republican investigators could be named. "We just don't want to have any part of FERGUSON," said one top Democrat. "He'd move the thing into Kansas City and New York and we'd never get him out of there." With FERGUSON out of the way, the Democratic Party could continue to be against sin—with considerably less risk.

Certainly, this body, and Congress as a whole, do not want to embark on an investigation of the type and importance of the one now proposed, which may have ramifications in every great city, yes, and in some of the smaller places, perhaps not in cities exclusively at all with suspicions of this kind, and I can multiply them with numerous others, as Senators all realize, from publications which we have all seen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the other exhibits which have already been introduced by me may be set forth at the conclusion of my remarks the rules of committee procedure for the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The importance of the exhibit, I think, is indicated by the fact that the rules indicate something of the supervision, something of the efficiency, which may reasonably be expected from the action taken by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was referring a few minutes ago to the junior Senator from Michigan (Mr. FERGUSON), whom I do not see on the floor at the moment. I have no basis for knowing what the intention of the distinguished Vice President is. I should certainly not ask him what his intentions may be in the event the resolution shall be passed. I have the greatest confidence in the Vice President. I esteem his friendship, and we are greatly honored, in my opinion, by having a man of his type and integrity among us, and presiding over us.

I desire to submit most respectfully, if I may, either to him or to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, or to whomever may be the appointive power or whatever committee shall be appointed, regardless of which one of the resolutions shall be adopted, that it would be a very decided mistake to leave off of the committee the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan. He is a graduate of the University of Michigan, a graduate of the Law School in 1913. He served as a practicing attorney in Detroit, Mich., until 1929, when he was appointed to the Wayne County Circuit Court bench.

As a member of the bench, he also served as a professor of law at the De-

troit College of Law, teaching courses in common law and procedure. The Senate is presided over at the moment by the junior Senator from Illinois (Mr. DOUGLAS), a distinguished member of the teaching profession, an author, a gentleman, a statesman, who I have no doubt would highly regard the professional work of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan as a professor in the Detroit College of Law.

In August, 1939, the junior Senator from Michigan was selected by his circuit court colleagues to undertake a so-called one-man grand jury investigation of gambling, of graft and corruption in Detroit and Wayne County, Mich. The Michigan law provides, rather uniquely, so far as I know, for a circuit court judge to act as grand jury, with full power. I understand he names his own investigative and legal staff, and acts in accordance with the procedures of a grand jury.

The Ferguson grand jury in Detroit operated for more than two years. Its activities included taking 20,000,000 words of testimony, from 6,000 witnesses, resulting in a series of more than 360 indictments and convictions of such prominent individuals as a former Mayor of Detroit, a Wayne County prosecuting attorney, a sheriff, a Detroit superintendent of police, three city councilmen, innumerable police officials, county officers, and lesser political figures.

The record of that campaign against civic corruption and the alliance of crime and politics in Michigan, brought Judge Ferguson into national prominence, and in my judgment was in no small measure responsible for the nomination and election of this great statesman, as he is, to the United States Senate, as a fearless and incorruptible public official.

On his election to the Senate, Mr. FERGUSON was immediately assigned to the War Investigating Committee, under the chairmanship of the then distinguished Senator from Missouri, the Honorable Harry Truman, now President of the United States. Senator FERGUSON has been publicly praised on many occasions for his contributions to the work of the War Investigating Committee.

He was selected as a member of the Joint Committee To Investigate the Attack on Pearl Harbor, and in that investigation, I am sure all Senators will agree, he proved to be a relentless prober after the full record of facts.

When the War Investigating Committee expired, under the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act, under which we are now operating, an investigating subcommittee was established in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the Senator from Michigan was made chairman of that subcommittee.

Under the rules which prevent a member of the minority party from serving on more than two standing committees, the junior Senator from Michigan was forced to resign from the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and its investigating subcommittee, with the opening of the Eighty-first Congress.

The Senator from Michigan now serves on the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, which certainly has a wide range of duties, and is not only a fine educational institution, so to speak, for its members, but gives them the opportunity for wide, detailed, and profound knowledge of the Government and its various activities.

The Senator from Michigan served also, as I have indicated, I believe, on the Committee on the Judiciary, and I can testify, and do testify, from my own personal observation of his work, that he is an invaluable member of that committee. He is tireless, he is diligent, he has a high intelligence, he is willing to speak his mind, and he is a fine lawyer.

My understanding is that altogether during his term in the Senate the junior Senator from Michigan has been either responsible for or a prime mover in more than 60 major investigations, most of them under the old War Investigating Committee.

My understanding is that some of the recent congressional investigations in which he played an important part are the following:

First. The Erie Basin Metals investigation, which revealed the corrupt practices of the Garsson brothers and of Representative Andrew J. May, and resulted in jail sentences for some or possibly all of them.

Second. The North American Aviation, of Dallas, Tex., investigation, which revealed a waste in manpower, and which resulted in freeing 10,000 workers for other employment in the aircraft industry.

Third. The Pacific shipping situation. It appears that approximately 190 merchant ships, usable in world commerce or for the return of service personnel to the United States and costing the Government \$380,000 a day to maintain, were found idle in the Pacific immediately after VJ-day. Action initiated by this investigation resulted in the return of more than half the ships within 90 days.

I digress to say, Mr. President, that I am not claiming that the distinguished Senator from Michigan did all this alone. Of course, he acted in cooperation with his brethren on the committees. But from my knowledge of him, as I have seen him operate in the Committee on the Judiciary and upon the floor of the Senate, I believe we will find it fair to assume that he was carrying his full share of the load in these various matters.

The fourth investigation to which I refer in which he had a part was that of the strategic war reserve, in connection with which the investigation revealed the unnecessary stock piling by the military of \$850,000,000 of civilian-type goods which were immediately declared surplus and for sale, thus to enter the civilian economy and return millions of dollars to the Treasury.

The fifth item to which attention is called is the matter of renegotiation of contracts. Numerous investigations resulted in recommendations of policy and legislation whose dollar value to the Government is incalculable.

The relations of former Senator Theodore G. Bilbo, now deceased, to war contractors is the sixth item. No Senator who was a Member of the Senate at the time of the conclusion of Senator Bilbo's membership will fail to recall in general the circumstances with respect to Senator Bilbo. I do not mean the specific situation, because I myself am not familiar with the matter of the war contractors, but we know something of the general situation into which the Senator from Michigan undoubtedly was placed.

The seventh item to which I call attention is the irregular relations with war contractors of a certain Representative from the State of Washington, the revelations concerning which resulted in his defeat.

The eighth matter to which I call attention, in which the junior Senator from Michigan, as I understand had a part in investigating, was the Canol project, which revealed the \$146,000,000 cost of the project, and also the inadvisability of the pipe line to Canadian oil fields. The investigation resulted in suspending \$7,000,000 actually allocated for further prospecting and exploration.

The ninth item is the matter of the Inter-American Highway. I understand that an investigation revealed the ill-advised project for not merely one highway, but parallel highway systems through Central America, to be constructed at enormous expense, and in the midst of the war effort. Further expenditures on the project were blocked, except upon assurances of closest supervision of the construction and maximum efficiency in maintenance.

The tenth item is the investigation of Hughes Aircraft and Gen. Bennett E. Meyers, concerning which our memories are yet fresh. The investigation revealed irregularities and weaknesses in the aircraft procurement inspection program and the improper wartime activities of General Meyers. As a result of the investigation, the Air Force has revamped its inspection program in procurement; General Meyers was sentenced to prison for subornation of perjury; and the disclosure of the nature of General Meyers' retirement on a disability pension resulted in an overhauling of the Army and Navy retirement systems.

The next item, No. 11, relates to the Arabian-American Oil Co. The investigation revealed overcharges on sales of oil to the Navy in excess of \$30,000,000.

Item No. 12: I have referred already, Mr. President, to the investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster. By reason of the vigorous efforts and questioning by the junior Senator from Michigan, the inquiry brought out the most complete record available to the public for an appraisal of responsibility for the disaster; pointed out the paramount need for a candid foreign policy; and pointed out the need for a revised Intelligence Service, which resulted in establishment of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Item No. 13: I come now to a further item in which the junior Senator from Michigan has rendered distinguished service. I refer to a matter with which my colleague, the junior Senator from

Missouri [Mr. KEM] is thoroughly familiar, and as to which he has addressed the Senate on more than one occasion, including the remarks made by him yesterday, on the subject of the Kansas City vote fraud. The preliminary investigation was made by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, in connection with which the junior Senator from Michigan rendered outstanding service.

The fourteenth item to which I call attention relates to export licenses. A preliminary inquiry resulted in freezing licenses for shipping certain heavy machine goods to Russia. Later inquiries revealed frauds and costly inefficiency, which had permitted large-scale exports of such items as nails and soil pipe while they were in critical short supply at home.

Item No. 15: Finally, I call attention to the loyalty program. This investigation centered about the testimony of Elizabeth Bentley, a confessed Russian spy, that there had been a Communist espionage ring in Government circles. The question of whether the Government's loyalty program was working to rid Government of subversive elements was tested by the case of William W. Remington. He had held a series of important governmental positions while under surveillance by the FBI and a Federal grand jury for subversive activities. The inquiry into the Remington case was blocked by a presidential directive which withheld key Government files, but the Ferguson committee was able to make a report recommending certain invaluable improvements in the loyalty program.

Therefore, Mr. President, I very respectfully call the attention of the Vice President and of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to the outstanding nature of the qualifications of this one member of the Committee on the Judiciary, namely, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I trust it will not be considered inappropriate or in any sense offensive that this comment has come from the floor of the Senate with respect to our distinguished colleague.

Mr. President, in conclusion I take the position, first, that I am strongly in favor of the Committee on the Judiciary resolution, Senate Resolution 202, submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] on January 5, 1950, now on the calendar of the Senate. I am in favor of it with the two amendments indicated, namely, to strike out the limitation of time within which the report of the committee shall be filed, and also to increase the amount of the expense allowance to \$100,000. I am in favor of it. I hope we can secure action on it. I realize that at the moment we are talking under the head of the ECA program. But to my mind it is of highest importance that at a very early moment there be action taken affirmatively upon Senate Resolution 202, the resolution of the Committee on the Judiciary, which provides that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and

directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of activities of organized crime, the effects thereof, and so forth, of questions as to whether or not organized crime is utilizing interstate facilities, or otherwise operating in interstate commerce, for the development of corrupt influences, in violation of the laws of the United States or the laws of any State.

Mr. President, I am equally opposed to the Kefauver substitute—not to the original document—submitted by the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Tennessee did not propose, independently of the action of the Democratic Policy Committee, any such proposition as is now before us in the substitute.

I am opposed to the program which the Democratic Policy Committee has brought forth as a compromise to meet a situation which does not exist, namely, the danger of two duplicating investigations under the two resolutions, Senate Resolution 202 and Senate Resolution 249. Mr. President, the danger does not exist. We have not adopted Senate Resolution 249, and there is no obligation on us requiring us to do so.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the special committee on the general proposition, first, that there is no need to bypass standing committees; that the standing committees, with their power of subpoena, their investigatory power, their ability to exercise a high degree of watchfulness, and with all the facilities of a staff, members of which are chosen solely on the ground of merit, and without regard to political considerations, are amply able to conduct such an investigation as is proposed. The standing committees are able to do all that it is sought here to have the special committee do. Therefore, Mr. President, there is no need to bypass the standing committees.

In the second place, I oppose the Kefauver substitute because the special committee would violate the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act. To substantiate that contention, I have produced before the Senate this afternoon witness after witness of undeniable ability and undeniable knowledge, headed up, I may say, by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], as to his views respecting the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act; in the case of the senior Senator from Illinois not only as to the intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act, but as to the sound reason which existed even before the Reorganization Act was passed.

Then, Mr. President, I have pointed out that a special committee would not be subject to the discipline to which a standing committee would be subject.

I have pointed out the lack of efficiency of a special committee.

I have pointed out the precedent which the appointment of such a special committee would constitute; and in that connection I have referred to the fact, as was so picturesquely stated by the Senator from Oregon, that it might very well result in a rash of other special investigating committees.

Mr. President, with all these reasons opposed to the appointment of the proposed special committee—the fact that the Senate itself has found it inadvisable to have special committees, and has only two special committees at this time, so far as I know, namely, one to be in charge of the reconstruction of the roof of this Chamber, and the other the Special Committee on Small Business, a subject comprising such vast and comprehensive problems that obviously they cannot be handled by even two committees—it is of the highest importance, from the standpoint of principle and precedent in the Senate, that we should not appoint the proposed special committee.

Mr. President, I shall close my discussion of the proposed special committee by referring to a further fact which exists in this specific, instant case; namely, that if the proposal for the appointment of the special committee is adopted, the general public obviously will be inclined to feel that the writer of the article in *Newsweek* is correct, that David Lawrence is correct, that the *Washington Post* is correct, that the numerous other newspaper writers are correct, when they say that the appointment of the proposed special committee will create on the part of the public a suspicion with respect to the sincerity of the inquiry.

I realize the integrity of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. He is a valued friend of mine. We belong to an organization in which both of us take great pride; I refer to the Kappa Sigma fraternity. I think I may say with reasonable accuracy that we are close friends. I have great confidence in him.

On the other hand, we do not want to handicap him, if he is to be the chairman of the special committee—and I think it is safe to say that he will be, if it is appointed—by creating in the mind of the public the belief that the special committee is created in order to whitewash the investigation and in order to keep off the committee making the investigation a Senator who has demonstrated conspicuous investigative ability; namely, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

So, Mr. President, with the request that the President of the Senate and my colleagues in the Senate will pardon me for the length of time I have consumed, I strongly advocate, first, the adoption of Senate Resolution 202 with the amendments I have advocated; and with equal strength I oppose the adoption of the Kefauver amendment in the nature of a substitute.

EXHIBIT 1

[S. Rept. No. 1317]

INTERSTATE GAMBLING

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 202) authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study and investigation of interstate gambling and racketeering activities and of the manner in which the facilities of interstate commerce are made a vehicle of organized crime, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, with amendments, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

AMENDMENTS

1. On page 1, beginning with line 4, strike out all down to and including the period on line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations by which such utilization is being made, what facilities are being used, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of law of the United States or of the laws of any State: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained herein shall authorize (1) the recommendation of any change in the laws of the several States relative to gambling, or (2) any possible interference with the rights of the several States to prohibit, legalize, or in any way regulate gambling within their borders. For the purpose of this resolution, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States."

2. On page 2, line 3, strike out the figures "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$100,000."

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENTS

The purpose of amendment No. 1 is twofold. First, it is intended to define more clearly the intent of the resolution and to make it clear that the investigation authorized hereunder may go into fields other than gambling. Second, it is the view of the committee that the investigation herein authorized should not be conducted for the purpose of passing on the merits or lack of merits of gambling and should not be used for the purpose of interfering with the rights of the several States to prohibit or legalize gambling within the borders of such States.

Amendment No. 2 is designed to provide for an amount which the committee believe is the minimum necessary to conduct the proposed legislation in a suitable and proper manner.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed resolution, as amended, is to authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study and investigation of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations by which such utilization is being made, what facilities are being used, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of law of the United States or of the laws of any State, subject to the proviso that "nothing contained herein shall authorize (1) the recommendation of any change in the laws of the several States relative to gambling, or (2) any possible interference with the rights of the several States to prohibit, legalize, or in any way regulate gambling within their borders."

For the purpose of the resolution, the term "State" is to include the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States. The resolution would instruct the committee to report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, and would authorize the employment, upon a tempo-

rary basis, of such technical, clerical, and other assistants as the committee deems advisable.

The expenses of the committee under the resolution, as amended, would be limited to \$100,000.

STATEMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 202, as amended) is based largely on averments contained in various newspaper articles, editorials, magazine articles, and material from crime commissions. Such averments indicate to the committee that it is desirable that the authority and direction specified in Senate Resolution 202, as amended, be respectively granted and issued.

It is to be noted that the subsequent material herein set forth deals primarily with organized gambling of an interstate character, but, there is also mentioned prostitution, narcotics, loan-shark rackets, swindling schemes, organized murder, and extortion rackets, plying upon legitimate business and labor in many different fields. The committee is of the opinion that although, as stated before, the subsequent articles deal primarily with gambling of an interstate character, there is reason to believe that interstate commerce may be used in furtherance of other organized criminal activities, and for that reason the committee believe that the resolution, as amended, should include not only gambling of an illegal nature, but any other criminal activity participated in through the use of interstate commerce.

The second progress report of the Special Crime Study Commission on Organized Crime of the State of California, on page 8, states as follows:

"It seems necessary, even in a progress report, to include at least a brief explanation of what the commission considers is embraced within the term 'organized crime.' Without such a starting point the whole direction of the commission's investigations and activities, and the reasons and basis for the commission's findings and recommendations remain obscure.

"Simply stated, organized crime is what the term implies. It is the activity of a group of persons working together for the express purpose of more effectively accomplishing criminal acts against society. By organizing, criminals are able to secure greater immunity from the law, a wider field for operations, monopolistic control over specific types of criminal activity, and of course, greater profits. The emergence and development during the past 20 years of criminal syndicates extending throughout our entire country is recognized by criminologists as the most prominent, the most threatening, and the least understood feature of our national crime problem.

"The problem of organized crime in California cannot be considered separately from the national problem. The central feature is the spread of national criminal organizations and syndicates into California. Unless the general outlines of the picture of nationally organized crime are understood, it is impossible to detect the presence, activities, and methods of the most menacing criminal organizations in our State.

"The great and dangerous criminals of today are not the publicized desperadoes of the newspapers, magazines, and radio, such as John Dillinger, 'Baby Face' Nelson, and 'Machine Gun' Kelley. The great and truly dangerous criminals of the present are the directing heads of the syndicates in control of bookmaking, slot machines, organized gambling, prostitution, narcotics, the loan-shark racket, swindling schemes, organized murder, and the host of extortionate rackets plying upon legitimate business and labor in many different fields—men who are almost unknown to the public and whose names never appear currently on any police blotters. Criminals of this latter type are

always difficult to identify. An inevitable effect of organization is to clothe the activities and participation of the leaders in secrecy. The directors and master minds of organized crime are seldom apprehended or arrested. They live peacefully and luxuriantly, enjoying a full sense of security, and with complete confidence that they will not be disturbed in their criminal activities. Their only real fear is concerned with the ambitions and competition of rival mobsters."

The Federal Government through the Office of the Attorney General of the United States has also interested itself in the subject, as is indicated in an article from the San Francisco Chronicle, dated January 11, 1950, which in part states as follows:

"McGrath announced that the annual United States Attorneys' Conference on February 16 will be attended by four groups representing local authorities active in the drive against bookies, numbers operators, slot-machine kings, and other law violators who operate across State lines."

The committee believe that there is need for the investigation and report as proposed, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be reported favorably.

EXHIBIT 2

[S. Rept. No. 1367]

INVESTIGATING INTERSTATE GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities, having considered the same, report it favorably to the Senate with additional amendments and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be adopted.

Two changes have been ordered in the resolution by this committee. The first cuts back the amount to be spent on the investigation to the original sum of \$50,000. The second requires that the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, shall report back to the Senate on its findings, together with such legislation as it feels advisable to recommend, on or before July 31, 1950. The scope of the investigation remains unchanged.

The proposals of the inquiry, as outlined by the Committee on the Judiciary, will seek to establish the following:

1. The adequacy and effectiveness of present Federal statutes relative to crimes involving interstate commerce.
2. The extensiveness of the use of interstate commerce which result in the violation of the laws of the several States.
3. The extent to which organized crime may corrupt the governing bodies in the Nation.
4. The extent to which, if any, syndicates engaged in organized crime may control the facilities of interstate commerce.
5. The extent to which the use of the facilities of interstate commerce by organized crime may tend to obstruct local authorities in the enforcement of local criminal statutes.

A proposed budget submitted by the Committee on the Judiciary in the amount of \$100,000 is included here for the information of the Senate:

Travel expenses (committee members and staff).....	\$6,000.00
Salaries:	
1 staff director at \$10,346.83.....	10,346.83
6 staff members at average salary of \$7,581.75.....	45,490.54
3 stenographers at \$3,980.59.....	11,941.77
Consultants on per diem basis.....	4,000.00
Reporters (cost of transcript).....	8,500.00
Per diem and other expenses.....	7,968.96
Fees and expenses of witnesses.....	1,000.00
General expenses.....	4,751.90

An explanation of the items of its budget by the Committee on the Judiciary follows:

Item 1 for travel expenses is intended to cover the expenses of committee members and the travel expenses of the staff. It would seem reasonable that in an investigation of this nature the investigators should conduct their work in teams of two together with an official reporter. The figure contemplates three such teams to be in the field for approximately 6 months.

As to item 2, staff, six staff members are grouped at an average salary of \$7,581.75. The six staff members should include one lawyer at \$8,024.17, one accountant or statistician at the same figure, and four field investigators at \$7,360.55. The foregoing presents a minimum for it is anticipated that the committee will need for its staff a variety of skills and professions: lawyers, statisticians, investigators, and experts in the criminal fields. In order to accomplish the intent of the resolution, it is believed that careful selection of staff members will make it possible to secure in one person two or more of the qualifications needed. Three stenographers at a figure of \$3,980.59 will be required.

Item 3, consultants on per diem basis, is included with the intention to permit the employment of specialists for short periods of time as the needs of the committee may require and will also cover part-time service of consultants who could not be employed on a full-time basis, should such consultation be advisable or necessary.

Item 4, reporters' cost of transcript, is intended to cover both anticipated hearings in Washington and in the field and also various needed conferences between the investigating teams on the one hand and State and local officials and members of the staff on the other.

Item 5, per diem and other expenses, is intended to include per diem in lieu of subsistence for four investigators and two reporters who will constitute two investigating teams expected to be in the field for the 6 months' period. This makes a total of \$7,968.96. This item would also include the sum of \$500 for shipment of baggage and records. Nothing in this item shall be taken to indicate that there will be a deficiency since the primary work of the investigating teams should be accomplished within the 6 months' period and the balance of their time occupied in Washington for the purpose of assembling and evaluating the results of the field work.

Item 6, fees and expenses of witnesses, is a minimum and probably would not cover all of the expenses for witnesses should the witnesses called before the committee demand fees and transportation expenses. For the reason that past investigations have indicated many witnesses prefer not to make this demand, it is hoped that the expenditures under this allowance can be kept within the budget figures.

Item 7, general expenses, is intended to include costs of telephone, telegraph, newspaper, clipping service, photostating, and all other expenses not otherwise itemized.

EXHIBIT 3

RULES OF COMMITTEE PROCEDURE FOR THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Rule 1. Five members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of such business as may be considered at any regular or special meeting of the committee,¹ subject, however, to the provisions of

¹ In Senate rule XXV, as amended by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (hereinafter referred to as "the act"), paragraph 3 thereof (last paragraph so designated) provides that each standing committee may "fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum."

section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.⁴ No member of the committee shall for the purpose of determining the existence of a quorum of the committee be deemed to be present unless he be personally present.

Rule 2. Unless otherwise ordered and notice is given, the committee shall meet regularly for the transaction of its business on Monday of each week while the Senate is in session at 10 a. m., and additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary.²

Rule 3. The committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action. Such record shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.³

Rule 4. No vote cast in the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, by proxy shall be counted.⁴

Rule 5. It shall be the duty of the chairman to report or cause to be reported promptly to the Senate any measure or recommendation approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.⁵

Rule 6. The committee shall, so far as practicable, require all witnesses appearing before it to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 24 hours before hearing, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their argument. The committee staff shall prepare digests of such statements for the use of committee members.⁶

Rule 7. All hearings conducted by the committee, or its subcommittees, shall be open to the public, except (1) executive sessions for marking up bills, or (2) for voting, or (3) where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.⁷

Rule 8. Whenever a nomination for an appointment to the office of judge of any Federal Court is referred to the committee, the nomination shall be referred to a subcommittee to be composed of at least three members to be selected by the chairman of the committee within 3 days after such reference to the committee.

It shall be the duty of the subcommittee to which the nomination is referred to fix a date, which shall not be less than 7 days after the date of such nomination is referred to such subcommittee, on which all interested parties shall have an opportunity to be heard with respect to the nomination, to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a notice to that effect as soon as such date has been determined by the subcommittee, and to notify both Senators of the State of which the nominee is a resident.

No such subcommittee shall make its report to the full committee with respect to any such nomination until the date so fixed has expired.⁸

² Section 133 (a) of the act requires each standing committee to "fix regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business before the committee," and provides that "additional meetings may be called by the chairman as he may deem necessary."

³ This is essentially the text of section 13 (b) of the act.

⁴ Section 133 (d) of the act provides: "No measure or recommendation shall be reported from any such (standing) committee unless a majority of the committee were actually present."

⁵ This is, essentially, the text of section 133 (c) of the act.

⁶ This is, essentially, the text of section 133 (e).

⁷ This is, essentially, the text of section 133 (f).

⁸ Rule 8 is, essentially, the text of the predecessor committee's rule No. 1, adopted February 17, 1941.

Rule 9. Whenever a bill or joint resolution repealing or amending any statute or part thereof shall be reported to the whole committee by a subcommittee, there shall be placed before the whole committee a print of the statute to be amended or the part thereof to be repealed (together with the citation thereof), showing by stricken-through type the portion or parts to be omitted, and in italics the matter proposed to be added.⁹

Rule 10. The chairman shall name subcommittees to which a bill, resolution, or nomination may be referred, and so far as is practicable, a subcommittee shall consist of not less than three members, one of which shall be of the minority, and if the subcommittee consists of five members, two shall be of the minority.

Rule 11. Whenever a subcommittee delays in reporting more than 30 days (except when time is extended by committee), the matter may be withdrawn by the chairman and submitted to another subcommittee.

Rule 12. The chairman of the committee shall be ex officio a member of all subcommittees with full right to participate in all proceedings thereof, but shall not vote as a member of any subcommittee unless duly appointed a member thereof.

Rule 13. Any member of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall have the right to have included in any report of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, a statement of how he would have voted on the matter or matters involved if he had been present.

Rule 14. Subject to statutory requirements imposed on the committee with respect to its procedure, the rules of the committee may be changed or suspended at any time: *Provided, however*, That not less than two-thirds of the entire membership so determine, at a regular meeting with notice of the nature of the change proposed, or meeting called for that purpose.

Rule 15. Whenever there shall be referred to the committee a bill providing for the payment of a claim against the United States based on either tort or contract, the committee may report to the Senate an original resolution referring such claim to the Court of Claims pursuant to the provision of 28 U. S. C. 257: *Provided*, That two or more such claims may be made the subject of a single resolution.¹⁰

RESOLUTION

Resolved by the Committee on the Judiciary, That, pursuant to subsection (3) of rule XXV, as amended, of the Standing Rules of the Senate (S. Res. 180, 81st Cong., 2d sess., agreed to February 1, 1950) a quorum of the committee for the purpose of taking sworn testimony shall consist of one Senator of said committee. (Adopted February 27, 1950.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

⁹ This is the verbatim text of rule No. 3 of the predecessor committee, adopted November 3, 1941.

¹⁰ Adopted April 12, 1948.

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson;

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin, and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor;

H. R. 4720. An act for the relief of Stella Ayner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is Senate bill 3304, to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; and the pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I propose to offer to the pending ECA authorization bill an amendment which will reduce its over-all total in the amount of \$500,000,000. This will be the first time that I shall have voted to cut an ECA authorization. I wish to explain briefly why I intend to do so.

First of all, in this action I am impelled by the urgent need for economy. I do not need to enlarge upon that subject. We face a budgetary deficit, this year, which various authorities have estimated will be between \$5,500,000,000 and \$8,000,000,000, and an even larger budgetary deficit next year.

Of course in this instance we cannot afford to make a cut which will endanger foreign policy vital to the security of the United States. But I believe that the foreign policy presented by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 will be promoted rather than impaired if the Congress indicates by something more than words our dissatisfaction with the lack of progress in the effectuation of that policy as it is set out in the act.

In its first phase, the European recovery program was essentially a relief operation. That phase has now been passed. Productivity in most of the ECA countries equals or exceeds that of the prewar period. This accomplishment represents a gigantic and praiseworthy effort by the peoples concerned.

But this accomplishment is not good enough, for the ECA countries must do something to compensate for the prewar trade now cut off by the Iron Curtain and for the loss of former colonies. Section 102 (a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 sets up as the goal among the ECA countries the establishment of "a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers." This section further declares it to be the policy of the United States that "continuity of assist-

ance provided by the United States should, at all times, be dependent upon continuity of cooperation among countries participating in the program." Furthermore, last year the Congress added to this 1948 policy the further declaration that it is "the policy of the people of the United States to encourage the unification of Europe."

Despite the vigorous efforts of the able Administrator, Paul Hoffman, little progress has been made in effectuating this declared policy of the act. There is danger that we shall subsidize a continuance of the conditions which spell continuing weakness and necessitate continuing relief that we can ill afford, in the light of domestic needs, civil and military, and in the light of the compelling need of organizing a far-eastern policy.

If we reduce the present authorization as proposed, the European countries concerned can more than make up the difference in economic health by arrangements among themselves, so that the surpluses of each, industrial and agricultural, which today are accumulating, can be exchanged among themselves for mutual benefit, instead of being dumped in the United States or causing local unemployment.

If further assistance during the coming fiscal year should prove absolutely necessary, a further authorization and appropriation can always be made.

In conclusion, let me make perfectly clear that I wholly approve of the European recovery program. I believe that, despite shortcomings, it has been worth all and more than the effort and sacrifice it has cost us to date. But I believe that both we and the free peoples of Europe can get out of it more permanent and lasting results if the Congress shows its concern to assure that this program will have the permanent benefits that were anticipated in the congressional declaration of policy.

I trust that if the Congress in its wisdom should decide thus to curtail this particular ECA authorization, the Secretary of State will effectively carry this viewpoint to the forthcoming meetings of the foreign ministers at London.

Mr. President, in closing, and at this point in my remarks, I submit the amendment to which I have previously referred, which strikes out the authorization figure of \$2,950,000,000, and substitute in lieu thereof \$2,450,000,000. I submit the amendment on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Ellender
Anderson	Cordon	Ferguson
Benton	Darby	Flanders
Brewster	Donnell	Frear
Briker	Douglas	Fulbright
Butler	Eastland	George
Byrd	Eaton	Green

Gurney	Leahy	O'Connor
Hayden	Lehman	Robertson
Hendrickson	Lodge	Russell
Hickenlooper	Lucas	Saltonstall
Hoe	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Holland	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Humphrey	McFarland	Stennis
Hunt	McKellar	Taft
Ives	McMahon	Taylor
Jenner	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Johnson, Colo.	Malone	Thye
Johnston, S. C.	Martin	Tobey
Kefauver	Maybank	Tydings
Kem	Millikin	Wherry
Kerr	Mundt	Wiley
Kilgore	Myers	Williams
Knowland	Neely	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Congress has created a Frankenstein's monster called ECA, which, unless restrained and controlled, threatens to destroy us. Money taken away from the American taxpayers has been sent to Europe by the billions of dollars. It is now proposed that we send over more billions—money which we have not yet taken away from our taxpayers. It is also suggested that untold billions are to be collected from our taxpayers over years to come to finance extensions of ECA. This can crush us. To safeguard the United States of America—and that is what the junior Senator from Nevada is interested in—I have introduced four amendments to the ECA appropriations bill which would set up conditions for further aid to any Marshall-plan country. These amendments would require each participating country to agree—

First. That any further aid from the United States would be loaned to private business through the World Bank, in line with RFC loans to private business in this country; it is estimated that if loans were made to private industry, the amount needed would be less than 30 percent of the amount we are asked to appropriate.

Second. That it will guarantee the integrity of private investments within its borders against socialization, nationalization, or confiscation, as we protect private investments in this country;

Third. That it will join in a concerted effort with the participating countries to form a United States of Europe, including Germany, similar to the United States of America;

Fourth. To eliminate any currency manipulation which prevents its currency from reflecting its actual purchasing power in terms of the United States dollar on the free monetary markets of the world.

In addition to my four amendments, I am supporting the amendment introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri which would stop our present policy of supplying many kinds of machinery and equipment and parts together with funds to process and manufacture products to countries which ship such materials on to Russia. This provision was originally made in Senate Joint Resolution 151, which was intro-

duced by the junior Senator from Nevada on January 24, 1950.

The ECA is part of the defunct foreign policy of the Democratic administration. The United Nations Secretariat recently reported that notwithstanding the billions of dollars poured into Europe by us, Europe's economic problem is not solved and the solution is not in sight. Our taxpayers' money has accomplished one result: The renewal of hundred-year-old feuds among the countries of Europe.

Now we are handed an ECA appropriation bill and told: "This is it. This is what the experts demand." On another occasion I am going to discuss the background of these so-called experts. Most of them could not hold comparable jobs outside Government service.

Are we going to fall for the administration's false propaganda again?

Do you remember that when the ECA was first being foisted upon our unsuspecting taxpayers, we were told that by helping Europe recover we would establish European markets for American products? That is conveniently forgotten now, and we are told that "buy European" is the new slogan, that when unemployment hits us, as a result, they will teach our workers new jobs and put them on relief.

The current propaganda is to the effect that, if Congress does not provide continuous ECA appropriations for the European nations to buy our goods, we face a depression in this country. There is nothing economically sound in such reasoning. If it is offered by well-meaning persons, the best that can be said is that it is childish. One wonders what childish reasoning they will offer us next. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that there is design back of such a statement. Congress should be on guard against scare-headings designed to force us into unwise legislation. It is much nearer the truth to say that if we do not stop this give-away show we face a depression from which we can never recover. If we do not destroy this Frankenstein's monster it will destroy us.

INVESTIGATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have talked to Members of the Senate who are very much interested in Senate Resolution 202, the resolution to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities. I do not see the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] present, but I am sure he will not object to a unanimous-consent agreement to lay aside for a moment or two the unfinished business, which is the bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and to proceed to the consideration of the resolution, Senate Resolution 202.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 202) to investigate interstate gambling and racketeering activities.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to vote on the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 202, and amendments thereto, at 4:15 this afternoon, the time until then to be equally divided between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois that, at 4:15, a vote be had upon the pending resolution (S. Res. 202) and amendments thereto, and that the time from now until then be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the situation, before the resolution which came from the Judiciary Committee is voted on, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute; is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Tennessee has already offered his substitute, has he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been offered technically. It has been read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. An amendment then, to the Kefauver amendment in the nature of a substitute would be in order, when it is before the Senate. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be subject to amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, since we have arrived at a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Senate Resolution 202 at 4:15 p. m., the opposition to the substitute has approximately 12½ minutes. I shall take but a little of that time.

There are two questions confronting us: First, should such an investigation as is here proposed be made? The Senator from Tennessee has very ably set forth the need for an investigation into the question of whether organized crime has spread itself across State lines and into interstate channels. On that question, there seems to be no dispute. I think the American public is alarmed by reports of the growth of criminal syndicates, and I think there is ample reason to ask whether there should be Federal law to cope with a situation which those reports would indicate does exist. I think we can take for granted, Mr. President, the fact that the investigation should be made, and that there is no issue on that question.

The next question is: Who should make the investigation?

It was the opinion of the Judiciary Committee that, under the Reorganization Act, it had jurisdiction of all judicial proceedings, civil and criminal gen-

erally. The Reorganization Act states that the committee shall consist of 13 members, "to which committee shall be referred all proposals, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to judicial questions." Certainly "other matters" would include investigations relating to judicial proceedings, civil and criminal generally, including the adequacy of present law.

The subject matter of this resolution very clearly falls within that category. It is true that the Federal Government, generally speaking, has jurisdiction in criminal matters only when the crime involves a crossing of State lines or the use of interstate facilities. That fact, however, does not remove the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee over such criminal proceedings. Nor should it bestow jurisdiction upon the committee which is concerned with facilities of interstate communication and commerce in such a general investigation, nor should it diminish in any degree the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

But what has happened since the Judiciary Committee, with the endorsement of the Committee on Rules and Administration, made its report according to the rule, calling for this investigation?

Mr. President, instead of acting on the resolution which is now before the Senate, the requirement of the Senate majority, dictated by its policy committee, is that we now substitute a new resolution which creates a separate and distinct special committee.

The effect is not only to bypass the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, established by the Reorganization Act. The substitute resolution has not, under the rule, been sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration to determine the amount of money necessary. The entire result, Mr. President, is very irregular.

Let me invite attention to the wording of the substitute resolution, as contained in the last section:

SEC. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than February 28, 1951, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable. All authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate on March 31, 1951.

This is more than a special committee, of the sort that was to be banned by the Reorganization Act. It is a committee which can recommend legislation. It is given not only the investigative authority of the Judiciary Committee, but its legislative powers as well.

Yet we are to place in the executive branch of the Government—the Vice President of the United States—the right to select a standing committee, to all intents and purposes. The substitute resolution does not even require that the Vice President follow the suggestion of the minority in the selection of personnel. I say, Mr. President, to all the Members of the Senate, that if we are going to have a two-party system, if we are ever going to have government which is bipartisan, we had better have it in relation to an investigation as to what kind of criminal laws we need in the United States of America.

What is partisan about an investigation as to what criminal laws should be passed by the United States Senate? Yet we have the policy committee of the majority party saying that they shall name five members of a special committee to investigate the situation as to what criminal laws are needed and should be passed.

Mr. President, this would not be an easy investigation to undertake. It will demand experience. We have had an example of what happens when we call before a committee those who operate criminal syndicates in the United States without first thoroughly preparing what may be required to be done and what may be asked of them, in order, if they do not tell the truth, that foundation may be laid for a charge of perjury. We have had an example of what these men might do to public opinion and what they might do to the opinion of the Senate of the United States if a case were not properly investigated. That is why I hope the Senate will not take from the Committee on the Judiciary, a committee which has had an honorable history in the Senate, which has jurisdiction in all judicial procedure, the criminal code and the criminal law, which is composed of lawyers, many of whom are former judges, the right to investigate the question of passing criminal laws.

Mr. President, I could argue on this subject for a long time, there are elements of high principle involved. I earnestly believe the problem is one which the Committee on the Judiciary should investigate. It is a matter which should not be placed in the hands of the executive branch of the Government through the Vice President. We should not place in the hands of the executive branch the right to determine membership on legislative committees in the Senate. We should not violate the spirit of the Reorganization Act by taking jurisdiction away from a qualified standing committee.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the substitute and ask unanimous consent that it be read by the clerk. I understand that it is not in order to offer it at this time, but I wish to make a few remarks on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, at the end of line 17, of the so-called Kefauver substitute, it is proposed to insert the following:

Two members of such special committee shall be appointed from among the minority members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary on the nomination of the minority floor leader of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in case the substitute should be adopted, I have submitted the amendment for two reasons. The first reason is that while two Republicans should be on a committee consisting of five members, perhaps not one Republican would be appointed. The ap-

pointment of Republican members of the committee is left entirely in the discretion of the Presiding Officer. In fact, so far as I can see, there is no requirement that he appoint any Republicans. Recently we had a proposal to appoint members of a Special Committee on Small Business. At that time the Presiding Officer determined that there should be eight Democrats and five Republicans on the committee. It seems to me that if the proposed committee is to be a committee of only five members, there should be at least two Republicans on it.

In the second place, my amendment proposes that the Republican members of the committee be appointed on the nomination of the minority leader.

I realize that there were certain special circumstances involved in the appointment of the members of the Special Committee on Small Business. I do not know about the majority members of the committee, but the fact is that so far as the minority members were concerned the Presiding Officer undertook to appoint them and did appoint them without any consultation whatsoever with the minority floor leader or the minority policy committee. The appointment of minority members of regular standing committees has always been upon the nomination of the minority floor leader. There has never been any question that the majority has always permitted the minority to choose its own members on committees. That was the practice ever since I have been a Member of the Senate until the appointment of the members of the Special Committee on Small Business, when that practice was ignored. I have said that I thought probably there were special circumstances which might have justified such procedure at that time. However, I think it would be exceedingly unfortunate to proceed to make it the permanent policy of the Senate. Therefore, I have submitted an amendment which would provide, first, that there shall be two minority members of the committee, consisting of five members, and, second, that the minority members shall be appointed upon the nomination of the minority floor leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I think that an examination of Senate precedents will show that similar resolutions have been adopted which gave the presiding officer power to appoint members of a special committee.

I do not have any particular objection to one phase of the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio, and that is with respect to the suggestion that two Republicans be appointed on the committee. However, I do object to the other part of the suggestion. In other words, it is the theory of the minority that the Vice President will not be fair in the appointment of a committee of five. There is no man in public life in the United States today who enjoys greater respect and who has a higher reputation for integrity and honor than the Vice President of the United States. A suggestion that the Vice President would not be fair and just in the appointment of

a committee of this kind does not square with the background of the distinguished Vice President of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I do not have the time to yield.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is a strange thing that it is the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] who should seek to defeat the so-called Kefauver substitute. Why is that? The Senator from Michigan has been talking about the Committee on the Judiciary. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. McCARRAN] has definitely agreed to the proposed arrangement. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the author of the resolution in the first instance, has agreed to the arrangement. Therefore the two members of the Committee on the Judiciary who are most interested in the resolution, along with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the chairman of the subcommittee which has been handling matters of this kind for that committee, have agreed that this is the proper procedure to be followed.

Why is it, Mr. President, that certain Senators on the Republican side of the aisle are practically demanding to be appointed to this committee? I know the reason, and the Senate knows. It is the first time in my experience that Senators almost demand they be put on a committee charged with conducting an investigation. I do not know what the Vice President of the United States would do with respect to the appointment of the committee. However, whomever he appoints—and I know he will appoint two Republicans and three Democrats, because that is the way it should be—will be men who enjoy the respect of the people of the country and the people of their respective States, and who will do a thorough and convincing job so far as investigating crime syndicates is concerned.

Mr. President, other Senators are capable of conducting investigations, and certain Senators do not have a monopoly on ability to make investigations simply because they came to the Senate with reputations of having been successful investigators.

The Vice President may decide to appoint the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. TOBEY], or other Senators who are members of the two committees concerned. Whomever the Vice President appoints certainly will be satisfactory to the majority, and they should be satisfactory to the minority. However, Mr. President, the minority wants to place its special Senators on the committee. They want that power. In the Eightieth Congress, I remember whenever there was a time the minority wanted something, they got nothing. In the Eightieth Congress, so far as any suggestions were concerned as to what

the majority should do, the minority received no consideration at all. The provision for the appointment of the committee as it now stands in the resolution is in line with precedents, it is in line with what was done in the case of the Pearl Harbor investigation, when the then Vice President appointed a special committee.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio will be voted down. I rely upon the Vice President of the United States to appoint to the committee Senators who will make the kind of investigation which the resolution demands. I want the Senate to understand that the Senator from Illinois is in favor of the Kefauver substitute. I want the committee to have the money that is necessary to make the proper kind of an investigation. I want it to have the kind of investigators who are necessary, and I want it to be surrounded by the kind of personnel who will do a job which will add dignity and prestige to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not want a fishing expedition. I want an honest-to-God investigation, without any politics involved, and let the chips fall where they may—not the kind of an investigation we have seen around here in the Senate at different times in the past.

Mr. President, that is all the Senator from Illinois desires to say. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in the brief time the Senator has yielded to me, I do not intend to comment on the personnel of the proposed committee. I am moved to speak only to express the hope that we may have a full and complete investigation of any interstate facilities which may be used for criminal enterprises.

I have a rather vivid recollection of committees in the early 1930's, when investigations by the Congress brought to the attention of the country the need for legislation, which was enacted into law, and which undoubtedly did tremendous good in preventing and stopping kidnappings, bank robberies, the transportation of stolen automobiles, and other criminal activities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me another half minute?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who is yielding to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. McMAHON. Did not the Senator from Illinois yield me time?

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair announced that the time had expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois, in my time, whether he knows of any instance in the Eightieth Congress when

the Presiding Officer, who was then a Republican, did not give the minority the opportunity to appoint their own members on every committee.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Ohio is talking about standing committees, yes.

Mr. TAFT. Or special committees.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as special committees are concerned, I do not know; I cannot answer the question at all. But I know what the precedent has been in the past, and I know what the leadership in the Eightieth Congress did to the minority many times with respect to courtesies of this kind. We got the little end of nothing whittled down to a fine point.

Mr. TAFT. I appeal to the majority for the protection of the minority. I say the minority should have the right to appoint their own members, not only to standing committees, but also special committees. In my experience in the Senate for 12 years, until the time of the appointment of the Small Business Committee recently, the minority had always been consulted, and their recommendations as to the minority members of the committees had been accepted by the appointing officer. I know of no instance in which that practice was not followed, until the case of the Small Business Committee recently, and the action in that case was the only reason why I offered the amendment. In that case the Presiding Officer undertook to appoint the committee, including the minority members of the committee, without consulting the leader of the minority.

What is involved is not a question of personalities. I do not know whom the minority will recommend. They may not recommend either the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Missouri, but I say we have the right, and should have the right, to nominate our members of the committee, that that is a basic principle of two-party Government in the Senate. So I appeal to Senators to see that that right is reaffirmed at this time, and that we do not now establish a precedent by which, when such committees are established, the majority will undertake to select the minority members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the parliamentary situation, the committee amendments to the original resolution must be acted upon before the substitute can be offered.

Mr. DONNELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. Will amendments other than the committee amendments to the original resolution be in order immediately after the amendments of the committee are acted on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any amendment to the original resolution would have to be voted upon before the substitute was voted upon, so long as it was not embraced within any committee amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Immediately following action on the committee amendments, will it be in order to send for-

ward an amendment to the original resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks so. Even if the substitute be offered, it would seem to be in order to amend the original resolution, and such amendments would have to be acted upon.

The Chair would ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment, in view of the statement of the Senator from Ohio about the appointment of the Small Business Committee.

The resolution under which that committee was appointed authorized the Chair to make the appointments. As soon as the resolution was adopted, the Chair stated to the majority leader and to the minority leader that he accepted full responsibility for that committee, that it was a duty imposed upon him by the Senate, that he did not seek it, but that he would do the best he could to select a good committee, that either of the gentlemen might submit a list, if he desired, but that the Chair would not obligate himself to appoint any of them or all of them.

The majority leader did not submit any list at all. The minority leader did submit a list, and two of the five minority members were chosen from that list. The Chair made the committee eight Democrats and five Republicans, because that is the ratio of all the committees of the Senate at this time.

The Chair accepted full responsibility for that committee. The Chair thinks the Senate intended that he should do so, he did appoint the committee, and he is satisfied with what he did in that regard.

The question now is upon the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the statement the distinguished President has made about the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief observation in reply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Of 1 minute?

Mr. WHERRY. I will make the statement just as fast as I can.

Mr. TYDINGS. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. WHERRY. I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. May we have the amendment stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the committee amendment ought to be stated, and the clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, beginning with line 4, it is proposed to strike out "of interstate gambling and racketeering activities and of the manner in which the facilities of interstate commerce are made a vehicle of organized crime" and to insert "of whether organized crime utilizes the facilities of interstate commerce or otherwise operates in interstate commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the

transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms, or corporations by which such utilization is being made, what facilities are being used, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of law of the United States or of the laws of any State: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained herein shall authorize (1) the recommendation of any change in the laws of the several States relative to gambling, or (2) any possible interference with the rights of the several States to prohibit, legalize, or in any way regulate gambling within their borders. For the purpose of this resolution, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As many as favor the amendment will rise and stand until counted. [After a pause.] Those who oppose the amendment will rise and stand until counted. [After a pause.] The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think there is a misunderstanding about what amendment was voted on. Is it the one about the date of making the report, on page 2, line 18?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, the Chair is advised that is not the amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I voted against the way I desired to vote, because I thought we were voting on the date, on page 2, line 18. I ask unanimous consent for a reconsideration of the vote, because I think the first committee amendment should be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment of the committee to the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Was that the announcement of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announced that it was agreed to. The question now is on the second amendment of the committee, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 18, after the word "date", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "but not later than July 31, 1950."

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "\$50,000" "\$100,000" and insert "\$50,000".

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that, for the information of the Senate, he should state that when the resolution was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary it provided for \$100,000. It was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and as reported from that committee the \$100,000 was cut to \$50,000, which is the amount contained in the original resolu-

tion. So that in order to vote intelligently on the amendment, which represents the difference between \$50,000 and \$100,000, the Chair is of the opinion that the vote would come on the amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary, which substituted \$100,000 for the original \$50,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the vote is "no" on the amendment, then the \$100,000 is restored, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The Chair does not think so. There are two amendments here, one by the Committee on the Judiciary and one by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. If it is not an increase of \$50,000, why vote on it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in the resolution. That is the only reason.

Mr. WHERRY. That is why I asked the question. It seems to me that a vote "no" on the amendment would mean a vote to return to the \$100,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair would be permitted to put the question as to whether it should be \$50,000 or \$100,000, that would simplify the matter. Without objection, the Chair will put the question in that way. As many as favor the amount of \$100,000 will say "Aye." Opposed "No." The "ayes" have it, and the \$100,000 is agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which has been printed and is on the desks of Members of the Senate for their information. By agreement with the majority leader the substitute has been modified on page 1, line 1, after the words "five members," to insert "two of whom shall be members of the minority party."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee desire the substitute to be read again?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the substitute was read on yesterday, and I do not think it is necessary that it be read again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the substitute offered by the Senator from Tennessee, as modified by him, which he has the right to do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which is somewhat repetitive, but I think it can be offered as it is. It will not contradict the other language.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, at the end of line 17, it is proposed to insert:

Two members of such special committee shall be appointed from among the minority members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary on the nomination of the minority floor leader of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As many as favor the amendment will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maine would vote "yea."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired on this vote with

the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business, and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business and is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—31

Alken	Ives	Schoeppel
Bricker	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Butler	Kem	Taft
Cordon	Knowland	Thye
Darby	Lodge	Tobey
Donnell	McCarthy	Wherry
Ecton	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Mundt	
Hendrickson	Saltonstall	

NAYS—39

Anderson	Holland	McKellar
Benton	Humphrey	McMahon
Byrd	Hunt	Magnuson
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Eastland	Kefauver	Myers
Ellender	Kerr	Neely
Frear	Kilgore	Robertson
Fulbright	Leahy	Russell
George	Lehman	Stennis
Green	Lucas	Taylor
Hayden	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	McFarland	Tydings

NOT VOTING—26

Brewster	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Cain	Hill	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Chapman	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	McCarran	Watkins
Dworshak	Morse	Withers
Gillette	O'Conor	

So Mr. TAFT's amendment to the Kefauver amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. This vote is on the Kefauver amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Okla-

homa [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from North

Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business and is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—35

Anderson	Humphrey	McMahon
Benton	Hunt	Magnuson
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Maybank
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Ellender	Kefauver	Myers
Frear	Kerr	Neely
Fulbright	Kilgore	Russell
George	Leahy	Stennis
Green	Lehman	Taylor
Hayden	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Hoyer	McFarland	Tydings
Holland	McKellar	

NAYS—35

Alken	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bricker	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler	Jenner	Schoeppel
Byrd	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Taft
Darby	Lodge	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Tobey
Eastland	McClellan	Wherry
Eaton	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Flanders	Millikin	Young
Gurney	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—26

Brewster	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Cain	Hill	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Chapman	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	McCarran	Watkins
Dworshak	Morse	Withers
Gillette	O'Conor	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the Constitution, the Vice President, having the right to vote in case of a tie, casts his vote in the affirmative.

So Mr. KEFAUVER's amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and Mr. WITHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—69

Alken	Holland	Martin
Anderson	Humphrey	Maybank
Benton	Hunt	Millikin
Bricker	Ives	Mundt
Eutler	Jenner	Murray
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Connally	Johnson, S. C.	Neely
Cordon	Kefauver	Robertson
Darby	Kerr	Russell
Douglas	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Eastland	Knowland	Schoeppel
Eaton	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lehman	Stennis
Ferguson	Lodge	Taft
Flanders	Lucas	Taylor
Frear	McCarthy	Thomas, Utah
Fulbright	McClellan	Thye
George	McFarland	Tobey
Green	McKellar	Tydings
Gurney	McMahon	Wherry
Hayden	Magnuson	Wiley
Hendrickson	Malone	Williams
Hoey		Young

NAYS—1

Donnell

NOT VOTING—26

Brewster	Graham	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Cain	Hill	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Chapman	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Long	Vandenberg
Downey	McCarran	Watkins
Dworshak	Morse	Withers
Gillette	O'Connor	

So the resolution (S. 202), as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to state that he will defer for a day or two the naming of the committee, but he wishes to announce that when the committee is named it will be in the ratio of three Democrats to two Republicans.

AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate now reverts to the consideration of the ECA bill, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3304) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended.

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Under Secretary of State, John E. Peurifoy, released a statement for the press yesterday, which I desire to read into the Rec-

ORD at this time, making certain comments as I go along. I read:

MAY 2, 1950.

The State Department has been asked to comment upon Representative FRANK M. KARSTEN's statement suggesting the possibility that, through deceit and fraud, the American people have been hoodwinked with the assertion that the State Department is saturated with Communists. That is a question which the Senate subcommittee must determine.

However, speaking for the Department of State as the officer in charge of loyalty matters, I can relate the facts:

This whole business started on February 9 when Senator MCCARTHY was making a speech before a Women's Republican Club at Wheeling, W. Va. While he was making that speech, he said:

"I have here in my hand a list of 205 * * * a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department."

When I heard what Senator MCCARTHY had said, I was amazed. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, under Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has the authority for investigating to see that only loyal people work in the Department of State. We have our own security organization, headed by Don Nicholson, a former FBI agent, to work with them. Neither the FBI nor our Security Division had told us about one Communist working in the State Department, much less 205. But in this business, we are very careful. On the outside chance that Senator MCCARTHY may have had some information that neither the FBI nor our Security Division had found out, the State Department telegraphed Senator MCCARTHY and asked him to send us the information which he had about these 205 people which he said he had listed as known Communists. We felt that if Senator MCCARTHY was interested in the safety of his country, he would give the FBI and our Security Division their names and any information he had on them. We have waited a long time for him to give us this information. We are still waiting.

On the night of February 20, Senator MCCARTHY made a speech in which he claimed he would back up the charges which he had made against the State Department. He hasn't done so. His 205 had shrunk to 81. They were not all "still working and shaping policy in the State Department" either. Some of the people he mentioned work in the State Department; some of them used to work in the State Department; some of them had never worked in the State Department at all. What's more, the nature of the charges had changed. They weren't "known Communists" any more. From reading Senator MCCARTHY's speech, we don't yet know just what he thinks they were.

Senator MCCARTHY hasn't backed up even the highly general charges he made on February 20. Over 2 months have passed. A special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been appointed. It is a matter of public record that this committee has asked Senator MCCARTHY many times to supply proof to back up his charges. But as far as the Department can ascertain, the Senator has not yet presented any evidence that even one employee of the State Department is a Communist. The single individual on whom Senator MCCARTHY has concentrated his recent fire is not connected with the Department. As Secretaries Hull, Byrnes, Marshall, and Acheson have publicly attested, he is not and has not been what Senator MCCARTHY called "the chief architect of our far-eastern policy." Finally, there is no shred of truth to the Senator's flat statement—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. My point or order is that under rule 19 of the Senate the Senator from Illinois is out of order.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I can make that point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the right to call the attention of the Senate to any violation of the rules.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois is calling the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] a liar. I think the Senator should take his seat.

Mr. LUCAS. I am reading the press release.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is using it in debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any Senator has the right to call attention to any violation of the rules. If any Senator impugns the motives of a Senator, under the rules, the Senator speaking must take his seat.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have not even finished reading the press release.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator does not have to finish it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must enforce the rule. No matter whether it is justified or not, when a Senator raises the point of order that the Senator speaking is violating the rules, the Senator speaking must take his seat.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to proceed in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JENNER. I object.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Illinois may be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. TAFT. I make the point of order, and I ask that the exceptional words be taken down in writing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Official Reporter is instructed to read the words to the point at which the Senator from Illinois was stopped.

The Official Reporter (J. Chester Wilfong) read as follows:

The single individual on whom Senator MCCARTHY has concentrated his recent fire is not connected with the Department. As Secretaries Hull, Byrnes, Marshall, and Acheson have publicly attested, he is not and has not been what Senator MCCARTHY called "the chief architect of our far-eastern policy." Finally, there is no shred of truth to the Senator's flat statement—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the vote determine whether the Senator from Illinois is in order, or whether he should proceed in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Whether he should proceed in order. The motion is not debatable. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seems to have it, the "ayes" have it. The Senator from Illinois may proceed in order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to read this statement and then let some Senator again make a point of order.

This does not have reference to what I previously read; it is another matter. I think this is a truthful statement, and I think the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] will admit it:

Finally, there is no shred of truth to the Senator's flat statement that this man "has, or until recently had, a desk in the State Department."

That refers to Lattimore, I presume.

That has no relation to the previous statement I have made.

I do not think anyone will contend under oath that this man Lattimore had a desk in the State Department, Mr. President. That is all that is said.

In his speech on February 20, Senator McCARTHY said that he had obtained his information from loyal State Department employees. He said that he had digests of the file he was talking about, apparently given him by his loyal friends in the State Department; and he hinted he had photostats of some of them.

Actually, all Senator McCARTHY had done was to shake 2 years' dust off of some old reports and produce them as his "newly discovered evidence." The old reports which he was using were reports made up in the fall of 1947 and the winter of 1948 by the staff of the House Appropriations Committee. In the fall of 1947, before the issuance of the President's directive concerning loyalty files, the House Appropriations Committee asked to look over the security program in the State Department. The committee investigators compiled a list of 108 cases concerning which they wanted to ask the State Department questions. Not all of these 108 worked in the State Department. Only 40 work there now, and after investigation and reinvestigation, those 40 have been found to be absolutely loyal. They compiled summaries of the "derogatory information" in these cases and used these summaries as the basis for questioning. During the Eightieth Congress, this list of 108 cases was gone into by the House Appropriations Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Yet none of these committees suggested that there are any Communists in the State Department. In fact, on one of the last days of the Eightieth Congress, Representative Jonkman, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs subcommittee, made this statement on the floor of the House:

"But before the Eightieth Congress adjourns, I want the Members to know that there is one department in which the known or reasonably suspected subversives, Communists, fellow travelers, sympathizers, and persons whose services are not for the best interests of the United States, have been swept out. That is the Department of State."

When Senator McCARTHY was making his charges on the floor of the Senate on February 20, he was simply reciting, somewhat inaccurately, items from this shop-worn list of 108 cases. In all of this hit-and-run campaign of accusation, vilification, and character assassination, the main burden of the so-called proof rested on that threadbare list.

Those are the facts.

I don't think it is appropriate for me to state whether the American people have been subjected to "deceit and fraud." When a Senator charges that there are 205 known Communists in the Department and when, instead of proving there is even one, he releases a succession of loose accusations against persons inside and outside of the Department, I am sure the Senate subcommittee is fully capable of making its own decisions.

Mr. President, why was this investigation started? I turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, when the Senator from Wisconsin made his speech. I asked the Senator from Wisconsin a few questions about the speech he had made in Wheeling, W. Va., before the Republican Women's League. The speech the Senator from Wisconsin made before the Republican Women's League of Wheeling, W. Va., is the reason for all of this investigation. As everyone knows, the headlines, not only in the Wheeling newspaper, but in every newspaper in the United States of America, through the press services, carried what the Senator from Wisconsin had said with respect to there being 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department, that the Secretary of State knew it, and that these Communists were helping to shape the policy of the Government of the United States in foreign affairs at the present time. Those who were in the Senate that night heard me time after time press the Senator from Wisconsin to state whether or not he had made that statement before the group before whom he had made his speech or whether he had made it to a group of newspaper men on the outside. The only answer the Senator from Illinois ever received was the speech itself. When I objected to the Senator placing the speech in the RECORD, he read the speech. There was nothing in that speech, Mr. President, which tallied with or paralleled what was said by the newspapers at that particular time—not a word. So far as I am concerned, the statement of Mr. Peurifoy, as Under Secretary of State, with respect to the 205 card-carrying Communists, which he makes at this time after weeks of investigation, carries a considerable amount of weight on the question of truth and veracity.

Today, at this very hour, thousands upon thousands of loyal employees in the State Department are still hovering under the shadow that was cast upon them by the Senator from Wisconsin in the speech he made in West Virginia, and the one he made in Utah. In Utah he had shifted from 205 to 57, apparently losing that many Communists as he traveled through the air from West Virginia to Salt Lake City, or Nevada, or wherever it was.

Mr. President, the time has come to call a spade a spade. The time has come

to ferret out and let the country understand what is back of these charges which have been made against loyal employees in the State Department. The time has come when we in the Senate, including the Senator from Wisconsin, must remove the cloud of suspicion of disloyalty which exists with respect to thousands of Americans who are now working in the State Department. Mr. President, if I were an official or employee of the State Department; if I were working in that branch of our Government, and I were to walk down the street today and someone looked at me in a rather strange manner, I would be wondering whether or not he thought I was one of the 205 or 257 whom the Senator from Wisconsin had named in his speeches. Yet, today, not a shred of evidence has been presented—not a shred.

Mr. President, this is what the Senator from Wisconsin said, what he read into the RECORD, what he claimed he said in his speech in West Virginia:

This, ladies and gentlemen, gives you somewhat of a picture of the type of individuals who have been helping to shape our foreign policy. In my opinion the State Department, which is one of the most important Government Departments, is thoroughly infested with Communists.

I have in my hand 57 cases of individuals who would appear to be either card-carrying members or certainly loyal to the Communist Party, but who nevertheless are still helping to shape our foreign policy.

Mr. President, the point I make is that that statement is in total variance—total variance, Mr. President—with every newspaper article which was published at that particular time as to what the Senator from Wisconsin had said upon that particular occasion.

Mr. President, I do not care to go further into this subject at the present time. The statement which was made with respect to 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department is far-reaching in its implications and effects. It is a statement about which the Senator from Wisconsin should have known something before he made it. I am willing to take what the press said at that time with respect to the situation, rather than the statement as it was read into the RECORD that night by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President—

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator desire to have me yield?

Mr. KILGORE. No; if I could get the floor, I should like to make a statement for the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I was in West Virginia on Lincoln's Birthday, strange as it may seem, addressing a Lincoln Birthday dinner before the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and I found voters very much perturbed and upset by reason of the statement which the majority leader just quoted. This had been printed in the Wheeling Intelligencer, a very reputable newspaper in Wheeling, W. Va.:

While I cannot take the time to name all the men in the State Department who have

been named as members of the Communist Party and members of the spy ring, I have here in my hand a list of 205 that were known to the Secretary of State as being Members of the Communist Party, and who, nevertheless, are still working and shaping the policy of the State Department.

Mr. President, the speech to which the majority leader referred was broadcast twice over the most powerful radio station in West Virginia; in fact, the station practically blankets the State. Ever since the making of that speech I have been queried every time I met a West Virginian as to what there is in this commotion. For instance, many persons cannot see why we should be voting funds to be expended in Europe, to strengthen the nations of Europe against communism, and at the same time have the policy laid down by Communists and spy-ring members.

I have become tired of it. When something worries the people of my State—and they do not like Communists—it worries me. It finally came to a climax with me on the 25th of April, when my former colleague, Dr. Joseph Rosier, wrote me a letter in which he said he thinks a book entitled "The Devil in Massachusetts," should be required reading for all Members of the United States Senate. That book, Mr. President, is a rather modern history of the witchcraft trials in Massachusetts. He goes on further in his letter and says that it looks as if we are engaged in a witch hunt, and that the people of the State are disturbed by it.

The next day, on the 26th, I wrote to Mr. Peurifoy, of the State Department, and asked him if the Department had any way of verifying whether or not the statement which had been published was actually made. I did not think all the persons in the Department would make any mistake. He sent to my office a transcript of the speech, two copies of it, one copy certified to by Paul A. Myers, an official of the radio station, who checked the filed speech against the delivery, and by another man who did the same thing, Mr. James K. Whitaker.

Mr. Myers, in his affidavit, says:

State of Virginia, County of Ohio, to wit—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, who is Mr. Myers?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Myers is program manager of Station WWVA, and Mr. Whitaker is the station manager of Station WWVA, which is the largest station in Wheeling; in fact, the most powerful station in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. LUCAS. The station broadcast this address, did it?

Mr. KILGORE. It broadcast the address, and these two men checked the script against the address as delivered, to make sure whether it was delivered as filed.

Mr. Myers' affidavit reads:

This day Paul A. Myers personally appeared before me, Lucille M. Bock, a notary public of said county, being by me first duly sworn, says: As program director of radio station WWVA, I read the attached 13-page speech script before it was delivered by Senator

JOSEPH MCCARTHY on February 9, 1950. I reviewed our tape recording of the delivered speech before WWVA broadcast it on that same evening, and again reviewed it, against the script on the following day. I certify that the tape recording was the same as the attached script with the exception of interpolations and connective words such as "a's"; and "and's" and "the's"; which to my way of thinking did not materially change the meaning of the text.

I have initialed each page of the attached photostatic copy of Senator MCCARTHY's speech.

PAUL A. MYERS.

Taken, subscribed and sworn to before me this 25th day of April 1950.

LUCILLE M. BOCK,

Notary Public.

My commission expires February 3, 1952.

On page 7 of the transcript is the exact wording referred to. I quote:

And ladies and gentlemen, while I cannot take the time to name all the men in the State Department who have been named as active members of the Communist Party and members of a spy ring, I have here in my hand a list of 205 * * * a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department.

That speech was made on the 9th day of February and, as I said before, that part was reported by the Wheeling Intelligence.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to read into the RECORD what the Senator from Wisconsin said, as he read the speech on the night of February 20, on that very point. This is what he said:

I have in my hand 57 cases of individuals who would appear to be either card-carrying members or certainly loyal to the Communist Party, but who, nevertheless, are still helping to shape our foreign policy.

Mr. KILGORE. Also, Mr. President, Mr. James K. Whitaker made an affidavit:

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,

County of Ohio, to wit:

This day James K. Whitaker personally appeared before me, Lucille M. Bock, notary public of said county, and being by me first duly sworn says: As news editor of radio station WWVA I was in charge of the tape recording of Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY's speech at the Hotel McLure, Wheeling, W. Va., on February 9, 1950. At the hotel I followed the prepared script as I listened to the speech. I certify that the delivered speech, as recorded by me, and on that evening broadcast by Station WWVA was in the same form as the attached photostat of the prepared script—with the exception of the usual added connective phrases and the addition or deletion of such words as "a's"; "and's" and "the's," which to my thinking did not materially change the meaning of the text.

I have initialed each page of the attached photostatic copy of Senator MCCARTHY's speech.

JAMES K. WHITAKER.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of April 1950.

LUCILLE M. BOCK,

Notary Public.

On page 7 will be found a paragraph identical with the paragraph previously read.

Mr. President, as I have stated, a statement such as I have referred to upsets the people. It creates disunity. When a statement criticizing one of the Government departments, and persons employed in it, comes from a Member of the United States Senate the people of my State feel, since he is an official of the Government that he knows what he is talking about. It is disturbing to them, particularly to the type of people we have in the Wheeling section, a large steel producing area, and in the big coal fields. We have, thank goodness, but few Communists in West Virginia. But such a statement as that to which I have referred is disturbing, and I feel that something should be done to reassure and perhaps to correct the attitude of our people.

Mr. President, I see that the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is present. I am not a member of the subcommittee. Paraphrasing what Will Rogers once said "What goes on in the subcommittee I know about only from reading the papers." I have not seen any statement like the one I read produced before the committee. I ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland whether anyone has testified before the subcommittee about the alleged 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I gladly yield so the Senator may answer the question.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, all I care to say now is, as I told the Senate the other day, that I have been working very, very hard on this case. I promised the Senate when I stood here a little while ago that I would make a complete and far-reaching investigation into all phases of it. Therefore, all I can say to the Senator from West Virginia at this time is that I do not care to comment on the matter he has brought before the Senate at this particular time. In due course, and when it is appropriate, I shall come before the Senate, and it will take me a considerable while to lay this matter in all its ramifications before this august body.

Mr. KILGORE. Would the Senator care to have the copies from which I have read, for the benefit of the subcommittee?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be very glad to have them. I assume they are pertinent matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield so I may ask the able Senator from Maryland one question?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If it is a fair question, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether the Senator from Wisconsin produced any proof with respect to the 205 persons who, as the affidavits just read show, he said were card-carrying Communists employed in the State Department and helping to establish its policy?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that all the testimony of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] dealing with Communists or disloyal persons has been taken in open hearings, and therefore the Senator from Illinois can draw the same conclusion from that testimony that I can draw. I do not care to comment at this particular time on that matter, although I am always glad to accommodate the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the Senator correctly, then, with respect to the 205 card-carrying Communists, so-called, anything that has been testified about them has been testified in the open?

Mr. TYDINGS. By the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LUCAS. Which has been nothing. Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me so that I may address a question to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if the Senator from Wisconsin has at any time been asked by any member of the subcommittee whether or not he made the statement in West Virginia that there were 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to answer the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not press that question, because it would not be proper for the Senator to answer it at the moment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield so I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KILGORE. I have already yielded to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I ask if the chairman of the subcommittee will at a later date in the hearings of the subcommittee try to reach a decision as to whether or not there were 205 card-carrying Communists, or whether there were 57 card-carrying Communists, or whether there was 1 card-carrying Communist? I think the American people would like to know from the findings of the committee just how many card-carrying Communists there are supposed to be in or out of the Department. That is something I should like to have investigated. As one Member of the Senate, I should like to know that.

Mr. TYDINGS. Without desiring to evade the Senator's question I will say that all matters pertinent to this inquiry will in due time be laid before the Senate. I prefer not to make any comment at this time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Although the Senator from Maryland has been very busy in connection with his duties as chairman of the subcommittee, I am sure he is familiar with the series of articles

which began 2 days ago in the Washington News, relative to the Amerasia case. I wonder if the able Senator from Maryland could give any assurance to the Senate that this matter will be diligently pursued since it does involve the theft of papers from various agencies of the Federal Government, including the State Department, so that once and for all we can have cleared up this aspect of the case, which has been of vital concern to the American people, Democrats and Republicans alike? I think, as the News said in its editorial today, that the able Senator from Maryland could perform a great service to the country if he were to go into the Amerasia case entirely and develop the facts to which I think the American people are entitled. Can the Senator give us any assurances on that point?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. To repeat what I have said to Senators who have been interrogating me previously, all matters pertinent to this investigation will be thoroughly investigated, and in due time the Senator from Maryland will lay a very, very complete report before his colleagues for their consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for one more question?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; I yield for one more question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like, if the Senator will permit me, to ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the articles dealing with the Amerasia case which have appeared in the last 3 days in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should say to the Senator from California that, so far as I am concerned, I shall not object, but I believe the Senator would be well advised if all matters of that character were not printed until the subcommittee comes in with its report, at which point, if the Senator thinks it pertinent, he can put the matter in the RECORD. I do not think we should load up the RECORD with articles pro or con, because if Senators begin doing so other Senators will present similar matter for the RECORD, and the Senator himself knows that such procedure would be endless. Since there are two good Republican colleagues on the subcommittee, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]—and our relations, in spite of some minor differences, have been very harmonious—I hope the Senator from California will give us a chance to go into whatever matters we think pertinent, and lay the facts before the Senate, without inserting anything in the RECORD at this time. But it is the Senator's privilege to do so, if he wants to do it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, as a part of my remarks—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield, if I do not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent the Senator from West Virginia may yield for such a purpose. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer and ask to have printed as a part of my remarks, Mr. President, the series of articles which began on Monday, May 1, in the Washington News, and continued on Tuesday, May 2, and Wednesday, May 3, dealing with the Amerasia case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The articles referred to are as follows: [From the Washington Daily News of May 1, 1950]

THE AMERASIA CASE

Time and again over the last 5 years the phrase "Amerasia case" has bobbed up in the newspapers and magazines.

Well, just what is the Amerasia case?

Why was it important?

What was involved?

And who?

And what happened?

The story has been told piecemeal as it unfolded. But never before has it been woven together as a whole, against the background that spells out its significance.

Many believe the Amerasia case is the key to America's postwar diplomatic debacle in Asia.

Many, including the Scripps-Howard newspapers, believe that if the case had been pursued honestly and vigorously:

Pro-Communists in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department would have been cleaned out.

General Marshall probably would never have been sent to China with instructions to force the Nationalist Government to take in the Chinese Communists.

Probably China would not have been handed to the Soviet on a silver platter.

Most important of all, the United States would not today be looking down the gun barrel in the frightful prospect of another war.

Once again an effort is being made in Congress to bring full public disclosure of the political shenanigans, cover-ups and whitewashes of the Amerasia case.

That effort will succeed only if the public demands all the facts, no matter who is affected.

On page 3, Scripps-Howard Staff Writer Frederick Woltman begins to tell in chronological order, the bold outline of the Amerasia story. His stories will tell how it started by mere chance, the climax of the arrests and the anticlimaxes of the strange suppressions that followed the arrests. These suppressions prevented the public from learning the full story of the theft of hundreds of secret Government documents during the war.

In today's article Mr. Woltman exposes the bare bones of the Amerasia skeleton. In his subsequent articles he will add flesh to those bones.

But Mr. Woltman can't tell the whole story.

Only a committee of Congress with the power to subpoena evidence and compel testimony can do that.

Senator Tydings' committee can find the answers—if it will.

And maybe it will, if public opinion insists.

You are part of the public. You should have an opinion about this matter. We believe this full account of it will help you to reach an opinion. Besides, you will find

the story, which starts today on page 3, an exciting and interesting one to read.

CHANCE GLANCE SET OFF FAMOUS AMERASIA CASE

(By Frederick Woltman)

Early in March 1945, an official in the Office of Strategic Services here happened to be glancing through an obscure magazine published in New York City, called Amerasia.

What he read sent Archibald van Beuren, security chief of America's wartime espionage agency, flying to New York.

It was an article criticizing the British occupation of Thailand. And it was, in substance, virtually identical with a secret report the OSS had sent to the State Department 2 months earlier. Some of the phraseology was the same.

In the Manhattan office of Frank Bielaski, director of undercover investigation for OSS, an immediate plan of action was mapped out.

For the war, then, was nearing a climax in both the East and the West. The American First Army was smashing across the Rhine, ready to pierce the heart of Germany. Our troops were chasing the Japs out of the Philippines. The Air Force was preparing a devastating raid on Tokyo.

The atom bomb was still a secret. Five months later it would destroy Hiroshima.

Investigator Bielaski put a round-the-clock surveillance on Amerasia's headquarters at 225 Fifth Avenue. Ten days later, at midnight March 11, he raided the office—without a search warrant.

The raiders didn't need to stay long.

In an envelope on a desk they found copies of six documents from the Office of Naval Intelligence, marked "top secret." Then they turned up not only copies of the original OSS report on Thailand but five original OSS documents which nobody knew were missing.

FOUND SUITCASE FULL OF SECRET DOCUMENTS

Finally, in the office of Philip J. Jaffe, Amerasia's editor, one of the OSS men found a suitcase, bearing the initials "PJJ." It contained scores of documents or copies of documents, classified "restricted" to "top secret." They came from Naval Intelligence, Military Intelligence, the Office of Censorship, the State Department and OSS. Nearly all of them dealt with the Far East, especially China.

Pocketing 15 of the documents, Mr. Bielaski headed for La Guardia Airport.

The next morning OSS headquarters here was thrown into a turmoil. Brig. Gen. William J. Donovan visited a high Navy Department official. Together they called on Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius. Mr. Stettinius immediately sent for Assistant Secretary Julius C. Holmes.

At the request of the State Department and the Navy, the FBI was put on the Amerasia case. President Roosevelt, himself, who had less than a month to live, is reported to have ordered the inquiry.

J. EDGAR HOOVER LED TOP-DRAWER MANHUNT

J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, had a complete go-ahead.

Since it involved thefts of documents from the Nation's most important wartime departments, it was to be a top-drawer investigation.

For 3 months the FBI conducted one of the most intensive jobs in its history. FBI agents watched everybody connected with Amerasia and its editor and owner, Mr. Jaffe.

Mr. Jaffe, a greeting-card manufacturer with a yearly income averaging \$30,000 to \$40,000, turned out to have Communist ties. He was a friend, they learned, of Earl Browder, for many years boss of the Communist Party. Mr. Jaffe had led or served on various Communist fronts, particularly

ones that promoted Soviet foreign policies, including Stalin's aspirations in Asia.

AMERASIA WAS BIBLE OF STATE DEPARTMENT BLOC

Amerasia, supposed to be an authoritative journal on the Far East, had a circulation of only 1,700. But Amerasia was a favorite—some said "the bible"—of the influential bloc in the State Department which saw in the Chinese Reds, rather than the Nationalist Government, the true destiny of China.

From issue to issue Amerasia strictly followed the Communist Party line on Asia.

A member of its editorial board from 1937 to 1941 was Owen Lattimore, professor of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University.

While Mr. Jaffe was under 24-hour surveillance by the FBI he met a State Department official. He was John Stewart Service, a Foreign Service officer and member of the anti-Nationalist bloc.

Mr. Jaffe met Mr. Service in New York City.

ROTH WAS JAFFE AIDE BEFORE ENTERING NAVY

Another Jaffe contact was Lt. Andrew Roth, who was liaison officer between the Office of Naval Intelligence and the State Department. Lieutenant Roth, the FBI discovered, had been Mr. Jaffe's research assistant on Amerasia.

While under consideration for the Navy assignment, Lieutenant Roth had been investigated by the counter-intelligence division of the Third Naval District in New York. The counter-intelligence report termed him a Communist fellow-traveler and recommended that he be not assigned to Naval Intelligence. But nevertheless he was.

Meanwhile, on several occasions the FBI tailed Mr. Jaffe to the Soviet Consulate in New York. Three times he visited the home of Earl Browder in Yonkers, N. Y.

Then, on April 22, 1945, the Communist Party chief returned the visits. Mr. Browder brought along a third person and all three conferred for 5 hours in Mr. Jaffe's Greenwich Village apartment.

The third person was Tung-Piwu, formerly a resident of Russia and one of the three top Chinese Communists who, through the years, had masterminded the Red opposition to Chiang Kai-shek. Thereafter, Tung flew to the United Nations Organization Conference in San Francisco as a delegate of the Chinese Communists.

FOUND COMPLETE DETAILS OF NATIONALIST ARMIES

This seemed significant because one of the secret documents Mr. Bielaski saw in the Jaffe suitcase was a detailed report on the complete disposition of the Chinese Nationalist armies. That report would have been invaluable to the Communist forces which were later to take over China. The report listed the locations, commanding officers, and names of all of Chiang's fighting units, including their military strength.

The FBI never was able to trace the transmission of any of the Government documents to known Communist agents.

Finally, its case in shape, the FBI turned all the evidence over to the Justice Department. The Department's legal experts appraised it carefully. Then, the Attorney General's office ordered six arrests. The order for the arrests was personally authorized by President Truman shortly before he left for his Potsdam conference with Premier Stalin.

On the night of June 6, 1945, the Department of Justice issued an official release.

HOW JUSTICE DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCED SIX ARRESTS

"The Department of Justice announces the arrest by special agents of the FBI of six persons, including a Naval Reserve lieutenant, until recently on active duty, and two State Department employees in Washington, and the editor of Amerasia magazine in New

York City, on charges of conspiracy to violate the Federal Espionage Statutes through theft of highly confidential documents."

The statute invoked, concluded the release, "covers the unauthorized possession or transmission of national defense data. The maximum penalty upon conviction is 2 years' imprisonment and \$10,000 fine."

Data "removed from the Government's confidential files," said the Justice Department release, "usually was turned over to Jaffe at meetings in Washington and New York."

While arresting Mr. Jaffe on a warrant, the FBI found four file drawers crammed full of the documents.

PUMPKIN WAS PIKER COMPARED TO THIS

There were 267 prepared by the State Department, including 2 top secret and 34 secret; 50 prepared by OSS; 19 prepared by Naval Intelligence; 34 prepared by Military Intelligence, and 58 prepared by the Office of War Information.

Their number many times over exceeded the State Department documents in the famous Whittaker Chambers "pumpkin papers" case which earlier this year resulted in the conviction of Alger Hiss.

The Amerasia documents, moreover, were far more important.

Among them was an order of battle report showing the disposition of the Japanese fleet before the Battle of Leyte and a description of the prevailing winds and the length of runways at the landing fields of Korea.

THIRD DOCUMENT WAS CRITICISM OF CHIANG

A third, marked Document No. 58, was entitled "Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek—Decline of His Prestige and Criticism of and Opposition to His Leadership."

The six arrested were:

Philip J. Jaffe, born in 1897 in Mogilev, Ukraine, Russia, and naturalized as a United States citizen in New York in 1933.

Lt. Andrew Roth, born in 1919 in the Bronx. He received degrees from the College of the City of New York and Columbia University; joined the Navy in 1941 after working as a research associate for Amerasia.

John Stewart Service, born in Czechwan, China, in 1909; a graduate of Oberlin College, Ohio, State Department Foreign Service officer since 1933.

Kate Louise Mitchell, born in 1908 in Buffalo, where she was listed in the Social Register, a graduate of Bryn Mawr and a co-editor of Amerasia.

Mark Gayn, born in 1908 at Barim, Manchuria, naturalized in 1943, a free-lance writer who, at the time of his arrest, was planning to go to Russia, India, and China as a newspaper correspondent.

Emanuel Sigurd Larsen, born at San Rafael, Calif., in 1897, educated in China and Denmark, a specialist in the Chinese Division of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, State Department. For a time he had been employed by Naval Intelligence as a civilian senior analyst on affairs in China, Indochina, Thailand, and India.

Bail for each was set at \$10,000.

RED PRESS SET OFF HOWLS OF ANGUISH

At once a howl of anguish went up from the Communist press. The Communist Party began a counteroffensive which spread to the leftist press and even to more conservative newspapers. Friends of the six went to work on prominent radio commentators.

The Daily Worker promptly arrived at a verdict of innocent. It called on "the American people" to flood President Truman with a barrage of protests for this "attack on democracy."

Lieutenant Roth, then on bail, wrote a series of articles for a New York newspaper lambasting the State Department.

Columnists accused Acting Secretary Joseph C. Grew, a leader of the anti-Soviet

bloc in the State Department, of attempting to "terrorize" and "intimidate" the critics of his Far Eastern policy.

GOVERNMENT AVOIDED COMMUNIST ANGLE

Actually, Mr. Grew was an innocent bystander. The Amerasia case itself had been sparked by Mr. Stettinius. But, so fast had the counteroffensive mushroomed that 9 days later the Acting Secretary took the unprecedented step of issuing a defense:

"There isn't any mystery about this at all. We heard somebody in the chicken coop and went to see who was there, and what we found has been announced publicly. * * *

"The investigation was requested to determine the facts about a substantial traffic in secret document affecting the national defense. * * * Ample grounds were found to cause the arrests and to bring about charges."

Throughout the Amerasia case, the Government carefully avoided introducing the Communist angle. That was to come out at the trial.

In the meantime, a special effort was made to have the charges dropped against Miss Mitchell and Mr. Service. Miss Mitchell, who was wealthy, retained Joseph M. Hartfield, a politically influential New York attorney. Mr. Jaffe was represented by a law partner of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat of New York.

DEFENSE ATTORNEYS CONSULTED CLARK

Defense attorneys made repeated trips here to consult Department of Justice officials. On at least one occasion they spoke with Attorney General Tom C. Clark, now a Supreme Court Justice.

Finally, in July 1945, the Justice Department presented the case to the spring term of the District of Columbia Federal grand jury.

All the evidence was in, including testimony of FBI agents, and indictments were expected the last day of the term.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT PRESENTED CASE AGAIN

Instead, the grand jury was dismissed. The Attorney General, it was explained, had agreed to permit Miss Mitchell and Messrs. Gayn and Service to testify in their own behalf.

Not infrequently in Washington Federal grand juries are extended over the regular terms for uncompleted business.

Nevertheless, the Justice Department presented the Amerasia case all over again to the summer grand jury. All witnesses had to return and tell their stories a second time. The new grand jury heard the three defendants and returned no true bills. This cleared Kate Mitchell, Mark Gayn, and John Stewart Service of all charges against them.

At the same time, it indicated Messrs. Jaffe, Larsen, and Roth on a reduced charge of "conspiracy to embezzle, steal, and purloin property, records, and valuable things of the record and property of the United States."

BROADCASTER MADE PROPHETIC TALK

A few days later, on August 13, a radio commentator, J. Raymond Walsh, made a prophetic talk over the air. A backer of many Communist fronts, he had been stoutly defending the Amerasia group. Concerning Miss Mitchell, Mr. Walsh said:

"People who knew her were dumfounded when she was arrested. They quickly came to her defense, for they knew she could not possibly have been guilty. It so happens that she had some very powerful connections, which probably led the State Department people to wish they had never heard of her * * *."

Of Mr. Service, he stated:

"His arrest brought some exceedingly powerful people within the Government to his defense. Again one can easily infer that those who began this affair wish they hadn't."

And, of the three indicted, Messrs. Jaffe, Larsen, and Roth, the broadcaster declared: "And one even hears rumors of settlement of their case without trial."

SHAKE-UP PREDICTED FOR STATE DEPARTMENT

A shake-up, meanwhile, was predicted for the State Department. James F. Byrnes had now become Secretary. Mr. Grew was on his way out.

Within a week after the grand jury acted, Mr. Grew and Assistant Secretary Holmes resigned. Dean Acheson, who had previously resigned from the Department, was named Under Secretary to succeed Mr. Grew.

Within 2 weeks, Mr. Service was reinstated "for important work in connection with Far Eastern Affairs" and congratulated by Secretary Byrnes "on this happy termination of your ordeal." Mr. Grew also wrote expressing pleasure at Mr. Service's "complete vindication."

There were still three under indictment in the Amerasia case.

On September 29, a Saturday morning, when Federal court is rarely in session, Mr. Jaffe was permitted to plead guilty. Whether any reporters were present could not be ascertained at this late date. The press services sent out a few paragraphs. And the story of the Amerasia case practically evaporated. It was a peculiar court session.

Robert M. Hitchcock, Special Assistant Attorney General, permitted Mr. Jaffe's lawyer to make the "statement of facts." Ordinarily, that's the duty of the prosecutor, since it guides the court in fixing the penalty.

When Albert Arent, defense attorney, asked permission to make a statement "setting forth the situation," Judge James M. Proctor, a respected member of the Federal bench, replied:

"Please make it brief because I do not expect to hold any extended session here this morning."

Prosecutor Hitchcock concurred in the defense statement.

And, when the judge asked him how long it would take to explain where the Government stood, Mr. Hitchcock replied:

"Less than 5 minutes."

TRIAL WOULD LAST ABOUT 4 MONTHS

Whatever use Mr. Jaffe made of the Government documents, Mr. Hitchcock told the court, "was largely to the purpose of lending credence or variety" to his magazine Amerasia. A trial, he went on, would be difficult and probably last 4 months.

He agreed with the defense claim that the Government "does not contend that any of this material was used for any disloyal purpose."

Judge Proctor suggested a probation report to guide him. Both the Government and the defense quickly talked that down, urging that a fine be imposed that very morning. (A probation officer, in District Court here, has access to the "jackets" of each case. These would include the complete FBI investigative report, including Mr. Jaffe's Communist background for cross-examination purposes.)

No evidence was introduced into the record. None of the documents were shown to the judge. If anyone from the FBI was present, he did not participate.

UNITED STATES ASKS DISMISSAL OF CHARGE AGAINST ROTH

The judge imposed a \$2,500 fine which Jaffe paid at once.

Subsequently, Mr. Hitchcock left the Justice Department. He joined the Buffalo law firm of Keneflick, Cooke, Mitchell, Bass & Letchworth. A partner of that firm was James Mitchell, Kate Mitchell's uncle who had worked on the case in her behalf.

The charge against Lieutenant Roth was later dismissed on motion of the Govern-

ment. Mr. Larsen, the last of the defendants, pleaded nolo contendere and was fined \$500. Mr. Jaffe paid Larsen's fine and kicked in an extra \$2,500 to reimburse his codefendant for legal costs.

REPUBLICANS FILED DISSENTING REPORTS

The case did not die here.

In 1946 the Hobbs House Judiciary subcommittee took a look at it again. The Democratic majority found "an astonishing lack of security in some departments or agencies of our Government." At the same time, the administration majority reported it found no evidence to justify adverse criticism of anyone connected with the Amerasia case. The two Republican members filed dissenting reports.

The Hobbs committee had held only one public hearing; and it took 5 months to submit a report. The report gained little public attention. In that postwar period, public opinion was in a confused state over the Communist issue. Most people familiar with the Amerasia background were dissatisfied with the Hobbs subcommittee's haphazard review. So again the case did not die.

CASE COMES TO LIFE AS BUDENZ TESTIFIES

Since the Communist conquest of China, there has been a rising public suspicion that the Amerasia case might be the key to what happened in Asia.

Mr. Larsen has declared he was an innocent victim of Mr. Jaffe's machinations and charged there was a mysterious whitewash of the chief actors in the case.

American policy did switch.

The Amerasia case has come to life once more. Louis F. Budenz, former Communist and editor of the Daily Worker, swore that Mr. Jaffe was a Soviet espionage agent.

And the Tydings subcommittee, investigating Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY's charges of Communists in the State Department, has promised to investigate. But it hasn't scratched the surface yet.

[From Washington Daily News of May 2, 1950]

HOW P. J. JAFFE, OF AMERASIA, LED DRIVE TO WEAKEN UNITED STATES RESISTANCE TO RED EXPANSION

(NOTE.—Hundreds of secret documents, stolen during wartime from the State Department, Naval Intelligence, Military Intelligence, and the Office of Strategic Services, were found during a raid on the New York offices of the obscure magazine, Amerasia. That was the start of the notorious Amerasia case. Now, 5 years later, there still is much about the Amerasia case that the public has not been told. There were mysterious moves and cover-ups, intrigue, and whitewashes as the case progressed and finally came to a deadend. Here for the first time the Amerasia case is being told as a whole against the background that shows its significance. Yesterday Scripps-Howard Staff Writer Frederick Woltman sketched the outline of the case. Today he exposes the background of its central figure, Philip J. Jaffe.)

(By Frederick Woltman)

Philip J. Jaffe is the central figure in the Amerasia case. He edited and financed the magazine, Amerasia. And in the magazine's offices the FBI found hundreds of secret Government documents.

Jaffe also was the man Earl Browder picked to head the Communist Party's front for swinging American public opinion in favor of a Red China.

On this mission Jaffe used several aliases. First as John Phillips, then as J. W. Phillips, he set up a so-called Friends of the Chinese People and became its executive secretary. And he published its magazine, China Today.

Later, as his identity became known, the name Philip J. Jaffe appeared on China Today's masthead instead of J. W. Phillips.

Through the ensuing years, Jaffe continued in the forefront of the Communists' drive to weaken this Government's resistance to Soviet expansion in Asia.

FINDS A WAY TO GET CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

Then along about 1944-45, at the height of the war, Jaffe struck oil.

He worked out a system of getting confidential reports on the Far East prepared by the State Department, Naval Intelligence, Military Intelligence, and other Government wartime agencies.

But, from the moment the Amerasia case broke in June 1945, the Government never disclosed his Communist activities which had so vital a bearing on the Amerasia thefts. Instead, the Justice Department allowed the prosperous New York businessman to plead guilty to illegal possession of secret Government documents. It gave him a slap on the wrist in the form of a \$2,500 fine.

Here are some facts the Government neglected to tell the public—or the judge in the Amerasia case.

Jaffe, who manufactures greeting cards for a living, had for years been contributing upwards of \$5,000 annually to Communist causes.

Originally a Socialist, he switched to the Communists in the early thirties. He began to write for Labor Defender, official organ of the International Labor Defense. Then the legal defense arm of the Communist Party, the organization has since been put on the Attorney General's subversives list.

"THE NEWEST AND LATEST DEMAGOG, ROOSEVELT"

The August 1933 issue published a full-page article headed: "Uncle Sam Exploits the Chinese People * * * by Philip Jaffe." It began:

"American capitalism is giving the workers of this country a new deal. The only thing new about this deal is that it is handed out by the newest and latest demagog, Roosevelt."

Around this time Jaffe got the assignment from his friend, Browder, boss of the Communist Party. In 1934 he started to edit China Today from his Greenwich Village apartment, handling all copy, correcting proofs, and doing the general editorial work.

The first issues, mimeographed, carried no masthead. Hence, its editor remained anonymous. But the May 1934 issue did run a back-cover ad: Lectures on China for May by friends of the Chinese people—Strike struggles in Koumintang China, by John Phillips.

Under that was an ad for the Communist Party's Workers' Book Shop.

The first, full-scale printed edition of Jaffe's China Today came out October 1934. J. W. Phillips was listed as an editor. Inside the front cover Jaffe published a letter to the editor which set the future tone of China Today.

"YOURS FOR A SOVIET CHINA"

The letter called for an end of American help to the established Government of China. It concluded: "Yours for a Soviet China, Malcolm Cowley."

Over the cover itself was spread a map of China. The Soviet districts were inked in red; the Red Partisan areas dotted red.

This map showing the progress of the Soviet conquest of China, became a regular feature of Jaffe's China Today. The Red leaders of that conquest are the men who now have taken over most of China's 400,000,000 population.

From there on China Today went all out for the Chinese Reds, even selling portraits of Mao Tse-tung, their Soviet-trained leader, at 25 cents a copy.

The November 1934, issue carried a piece signed J. W. Phillips. Jaffe, who later had

an income reported to be more than \$30,000 a year, wrote:

"Fascism in the western countries is a product of the decadent period of capitalism. Capitalism has outlived its historic role as the organizer and builder of modern life."

In his December 1934 issue, Jaffe published this comment:

"If the people of the United States know what is happening in China, if they knew the glorious history of the Chinese Communists * * * there will be a storm of protest against American and European aid for Chiang Kai-shek. * * *

"Thus, in telling the story of China to our people, your magazine is helping to protect the future of the Soviet Union."

SWITCH TO CHIANG IN FEBRUARY 1939

Five years afterward, Russia's position on Chiang switched. World communism decided to work with him in "a united front against Fascist aggression." China Today and the American Friends of the Chinese People, as it was then named, went right along.

The February 1939 China Today ran an article favorable to the Generalissimo, comparing him with George Washington. It was titled: "Two Fathers of Their Countries."

Earlier, in June 1930, the magazine published a photograph of the Communist Party's May Day parade. Jaffe was in the picture with a delegation from the American Friends of the Chinese People.

His magazine frequently advertised monster mass meetings on China, featuring Earl Browder as principal speaker. One such, in October 1935, listed J. W. Phillips as chairman.

After Pearl Harbor, China Today mysteriously disbanded. The Communists were concentrating on opening a second front for Russia, rather than helping China. By now, the name of Philip J. Jaffe had appeared on its masthead.

CONSPIRING AND TEACHING AT THE SAME TIME

At the very time Jaffe was conspiring to steal Government documents on the Far East he was teaching at the Jefferson School in New York. That's the Communist Party's official training school for pounding Stalinism-Marxism into future Red leaders. His subject was: The Far East in World Affairs.

He helped organize and was a national director of the American Council on Soviet Relations and its successor, the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Both, listed as subversive by the Attorney General, have served as the leading pro-Soviet propaganda outfits in America.

He was active in the American Writers Congress and the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy, both on the Attorney General's list.

Today Jaffe is consultant for the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, the Communist Party's newest front for a Soviet China. It's also listed as Communist by the Government.

None of these facts were made public by the Government in the Amerasia stolen-documents case.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 3, 1950]

AMERASIA JUDGE WASN'T TOLD OF JAFFE'S RED TIES

(NOTE.—Almost 5 years ago the Amerasia case came to an obscure end in a rare Saturday session of District Court here, remarkable for the fact that the judge learned as little about the case as the public has before or since. Today Scripps-Howard Writer Frederick Woltman, who has investigated the bewildering facets of the case which produced more stolen Government documents than Whittaker Chambers, tells of this

strange legal climax in the third of a series of stories.)

(By Frederick Woltman)

Philip J. Jaffe's Communist record was not mentioned by the Government in the court hearing that wound up the Amerasia case of the stolen State Department documents.

Not a single reference to it appeared in the 15-page transcript of the court record.

Nor was the judge told that Amerasia magazine, which used confidential data from rifled State Department files on the Far East, was dedicated to the promotion of the Communist Party line on China.

This would have been of the utmost importance to the court. For, the punishment to be meted out depended on Mr. Jaffe's motives and the use he made of the hundreds of secret State Department and military and naval intelligence records found in his office as editor of the magazine.

The Government recommended against a jail sentence. Consequently the key figure in the Amerasia case escaped with a \$2,500 fine after pleading guilty. And the sensational evidence painstakingly dug up by the FBI was kept from the public.

Mr. Jaffe pleaded guilty here in Washington on September 29, 1945, before Justice James M. Proctor, a respected member of the Federal bench who now sits on the United States Court of Appeals.

The charge was "violation of section title XV888, United States Code, which is conspiracy to embezzle, steal, and purloin property, records, and valuable things of record and property of the United States."

CONDUCT OF CASE WAS UNUSUAL FROM OUTSET

The hearing took place on a Saturday morning, when the District Court rarely sits. It got little attention.

Robert M. Hitchcock, Special Assistant Attorney General, permitted Mr. Jaffe's lawyer to make the statement of facts. Ordinarily, in a guilty plea, that's the job of the prosecutor, since it guides the court in fixing the penalty.

When Albert Arent, defense attorney, asked permission to make a statement, Judge Proctor replied:

"Please make it brief because I do not expect to hold any extended session here this morning."

Later, when the judge suggested the Government explain where it stood and asked how long that would take, Mr. Hitchcock replied: "Less than 5 minutes."

NOT "DISLOYAL PURPOSE" BUT "JOURNALISTIC ZEAL"

Mr. Arent described his client as "for many years a student of far-eastern affairs"; a graduate of Columbia with A. B. and M. A. degrees; a lecturer at Harvard, Vassar, Yale, Dartmouth, and other schools.

Among co-founders of his magazine Amerasia, the defense counsel said, "were distinguished academic people, scholars, political scientists like Owen Lattimore, head of the Walter Hines Page School of Diplomacy and International Relations at Johns Hopkins * * *."

For 8 years, he went on, Mr. Jaffe edited Amerasia "without compensation and at considerable sacrifice."

It circulated "amongst scholars and specialists in far eastern affairs and has found a place in the leading libraries and educational institutions of the country."

"The Government does not contend that any of this material was used for any disloyal purpose," said Mr. Arent.

"If Mr. Jaffe has transgressed the law, it seems he has done so from an excess of journalistic zeal * * *."

Judge Proctor, interposing, remarked: "There is no doubt but what he has."

The indictment, declared Mr. Jaffe's attorneys, "charges a relatively minor violation

which arose out of his anxiety to be accurately informed in the field of his scholarly and journalistic interest."

He urged that Mr. Jaffe's case be disposed of that morning because of "the very grave illness of his wife."

Asked by the court if that was "a correct statement," the special Assistant Attorney General answered:

"In substance, yes, Your Honor."

NO PROBATION OFFICER SAW JAFFE JACKET

Then Judge Proctor proposed that the probation officer investigate and report so that the case "take the usual course of such cases with a view to possible probation . . ."

Had that been done, the probation officer would have access to the Jaffe "jacket" in the United States attorney's office. This includes the FBI "prosecutive summary report" as well as Mr. Jaffe's vast Communist background and that of Amerasia.

Here Mr. Hitchcock told the court: "I assume that prior to the imposition of sentence, which I think counsel hoped to be disposed of today inasmuch as we have the facts pertinent to the subject, that perhaps even a probation officer would get not only from this district but would have to go to New York for, Your Honor may wish to hear what the Government has to say."

Mr. Jaffe, he went on, was charged with conspiracy in taking and removing from Government files, primarily the State Department, Office of Naval Intelligence, Strategic Services and War Information, certain documents that belong to these various agencies.

"The use to which they were put was, as I understand it, largely background material that Mr. Jaffe in the conduct of his Amerasia magazine used to assist him in publishing articles and preparing arguments that would lend to its weight and, perhaps, its circulation. The magazine, we know as a matter of fact, was a losing proposition financially."

Asked if the documents were used in such a way as to embarrass the Army or Navy in the conduct of the war, Mr. Hitchcock said there was no such evidence.

"To us," he went on, "it was largely to the purpose of lending credence or variety to the publication itself, and perhaps increase its circulation and prestige." The documents, the prosecutor added, "were undoubtedly used by him—else, why take them?"

RECOMMENDED FINE, NO JAIL SENTENCE

Asked for a recommendation, the Government attorney proposed "the imposition of no jail sentence but that a substantial fine be imposed." Mr. Jaffe, he added, "is a well-to-do man—the sole owner, we understand, of a prosperous greeting-card business."

"Well," said the judge, "I regret, Mr. Jaffe, that you in your zeal to carry on your work, which was evidently for a trustworthy purpose, that you were misled to do these things which, of course, did tend to break down the fidelity of Government employees and officials in the performance of their work."

He set the fine at \$2,500 which Mr. Jaffe paid immediately.

Nowhere does the record show that Mr. Jaffe had been recruited by Earl Browder, Communist boss, to head the party's front for a Red China: that Amerasia was started by Mr. Jaffe, Frederick V. Field, wealthy Communist Party member, and Ch'ao-ting Chi, a leading Chinese Communist; or that Amerasia, which used the documents, was dedicated to influencing American public opinion and the State Department in behalf of Russia's aspirations in the Far East.

Not one of the stolen documents was introduced. Nor was the word communism mentioned.

If any FBI agents were present, they took no part.

HITCHCOCK JOINED FIRM OF DEFENDANT'S UNCLE

Fifteen months later Mr. Hitchcock resigned from the Justice Department. He joined the Buffalo law firm of Kenefick, Cooke, Mitchell, Bass & Letchworth.

James Mitchell, a partner of the firm, was an uncle of Kate Louise Mitchell, Mr. Jaffe's coeditor of Amerasia, who was arrested in the Amerasia case but later cleared by the grand jury. Mr. Mitchell had been active in behalf of his niece.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like simply to make the observation that I have accumulated a great deal of data about which even the committee knows nothing. That is not due to the fact that I have gotten it from our staff, because I have not. I have accumulated it myself by hard and diligent work into the late hours of the night. I believe I know a great deal more at this moment about the whole case and its ramifications than does any other man in America. I say that with no thought of immodesty. If the Senate and the country will just wait until we come in with the report I am sure it will be very instructive.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. For what purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to ask the Senator from Maryland a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question is this: Does the Senator from Maryland agree that the enabling resolution permits the subcommittee, of which he is the distinguished chairman, to investigate the Amerasia case? The language in the resolution not only covers those in the employment of the State Department now, but those who heretofore have been in its employment, who might be disloyal.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland is fully aware of all the privileges and responsibilities and duties encompassed in the terminology of the resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator answered the question of whether or not it will permit an investigation of the case referred to?

Mr. TYDINGS. If it is within the purview of the resolution, the Senator from Michigan would know that as well as I would. I am not going to be drawn out into a discussion of this case. I have taken a good deal of vilification and abuse on the floor of the Senate; but a long time ago I learned an old proverb that "The spoken word is your master. The unspoken word is your slave."

I think perhaps that will be an appropriate proverb for all of us to bear in mind when I lay the facts before the Senate at the conclusion of the investigation.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I previously agreed to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield now to me—

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be very brief. I simply wish to ask the Senator two or three questions.

I think the question of the 205 cases arises in large part from a letter written by the Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, on July 26, 1946. That letter is reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, 1950. In view of that letter, I should like to have clarification made of two or three points.

Has the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Maryland is chairman been cognizant of the fact that there seems to be a misunderstanding as to who made the investigation of the 205 cases? I ask that question because the letter was inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin, and it refers to 284 cases. Action was taken on 79 of them, and that leaves 205. That is the basis of the matter; and those of us who are familiar with the activities at that time know that Secretary Byrnes dealt with 205 cases.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to interrupt the Senator, if I may, long enough to say that if there was an investigation during the Eightieth Congress, the Congress preceding this one, by the House Appropriations Committee, by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and by the Senate Appropriations Committee, public documents will show whether or not that is so.

The Senator from Maryland has not been idle while a great deal of oratory has been indulged in on the floor of the Senate. In due time the Senator from Maryland will respond to the question of whether or not the affidavits and the paper issued by the State Department and the other matters referred to here are to be taken at face value.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point I should like to reach is this: The letter from Secretary Byrnes says the investigation was made by the screening committee of the Department. On the other hand, the Senator from Wisconsin said it was done by the Security Board appointed by the President. Could not the committee ascertain the correct situation in that connection?

Mr. TYDINGS. We can.

Mr. ANDERSON. Seventy-nine cases were acted upon. The Senator from Wisconsin is under the impression, I am sure, that they had been labeled bad security risks.

The report from the Secretary of State is that at least the first 26 were aliens who could not be employed in peacetime, but could have been employed in time of war. Could not the committee make a finding as to the facts regarding the 79 thus involved?

Mr. TYDINGS. We could.

Mr. ANDERSON. There remain 205. The impression the Senator from Wisconsin has is that the President's Loyalty Board labeled them bad-security risks. My understanding was that it did just

the reverse, namely, that it screened them.

Since the 205 cases started this whole matter, regardless of whether those names were brought in by the Senator from Wisconsin or by anyone else, could not the committee take those 205 cases and give the Senate a report on them?

Mr. TYDINGS. We could.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask the date of the letter of Secretary Byrnes.

Mr. ANDERSON. The date of the letter of Secretary Byrnes was July 26, 1946.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I now yield to my colleague from West Virginia, to permit him to ask a question.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I desire the floor in my own right as soon as my distinguished colleague concludes his remarks.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well. Then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for a question which I wish to ask of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In this afternoon's Evening Star there appears an article by Miss Doris Fleenon, in which the following is stated, among other things:

The Tydings subcommittee of the Senate will momentarily disclose the whole story in detail. It will show that—

Every name on the list of 81 supposed Communist sympathizers handed to Senator Tydings by Senator McCarthy appears on the old House list.

The descriptions given by Senator McCarthy of the 81 tally in substance in every instance with the descriptions given in the House record, as to ages, dates, type of work, background, etc. In some instances Senator McCarthy scarcely bothered to change the wording.

Can the Senator from Maryland tell me whether that statement is true and correct or whether that statement will be investigated with respect to the 81 cases?

Mr. TYDINGS. As I said a moment ago, the Senator from Maryland is not hearing anything much this afternoon that is new. In the subcommittee we have been so busy conducting hearings that there is much data which I have assembled which I have not as yet had an opportunity to lay before the subcommittee.

What the Senator from Illinois asks is a very pertinent question. If he will forgive me, I prefer at this time not to make an answer.

Mr. LUCAS. So long as the question is pertinent, I forgive the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is pertinent, and I think the Senator from Maryland is well advised about the ramifications of this whole case.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, unhappily, this communistic warfare was

started at Wheeling, W. Va., in a congressional district which honored me with five elections to the House of Representatives.

The people of West Virginia have been intensely interested in this extraordinary matter ever since the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCarthy] made his sensational speech in Wheeling on the ninth day of last February.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from West Virginia will yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield for a question.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I wished to ask the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Kilgore] this question, but he refused to yield to me. So I could not ask the question then.

Therefore, I should like to ask it of the junior Senator from West Virginia.

In view of the fact that we are playing this numbers game today, I should like to ask the Senator whether he is aware of the fact that during the Lincoln Day speaking tour I made, I sent to the President of the United States a telegram in which I called attention to the 57 names I had, and also said, "Mr. President, you can have those names if you desire them." At that time I also called attention to the letter of Secretary Byrnes in which he points out that his own security board or loyalty board—and there were some fine men on that board also—labeled approximately 300 as improper for State Department employment. The actual number is 284 or 285. I called attention in that wire to the President the fact that only about 80 of those men were discharged—

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I yield for a question—not for a speech.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am asking the Senator from West Virginia whether he is aware of the fact that on that speaking tour I sent the President such a telegram, which I assume he still has, so that there will be recorded in his mind and in the mind of everyone, the fact that in that telegram I referred to the 57 names which I said I had, and the 205 names which I said were named by the President's own security board, and which persons were not discharged.

So I think we should be done with this silly numbers game.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I am familiar with all that has appeared in the papers concerning the matters mentioned by the Senator from Wisconsin. Let me assure him that it is not my intention to discuss anything as unimportant as a numbers game or racket.

My very limited relations with the Secretary of State have been uniformly friendly. My intimate associations with the able Senator from Wisconsin, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I am the chairman, have been harmonious and pleasant in the highest degree. There is not a single reason—personal or political—that would induce me to help or hurt either of these high officials at the expense of the other. Whatever I may say or do relative to the bitter controversy

raging between the Senator and the Secretary of State will be prompted solely by a desire to discharge fully and fairly my official duty to all concerned.

Soon after the Senator from Wisconsin delivered his West Virginia speech, which appeared in the Wheeling Intelligencer, and from which I shall later quote, I ventured to tell him that, in my opinion, if he, by legal evidence, conclusively proved that with the knowledge and consent of Secretary Acheson there were 205 Communists in the Department of State, he would thereby render his country one of the greatest services that has been performed since the days of the immortal Washington; but that if those charges failed, and the people became convinced that they were without justification, he would be not only discredited but retired from public office and disgraced forever.

If Secretary Acheson has knowingly harbored 205 Communists, or even one Communist in the Department of State, he should be scourged from office and, by unanimous consent, degraded to the level of Benedict Arnold for being a traitor to the United States. But if it becomes apparent that the Secretary is completely guiltless of these charges, he should be handsomely vindicated, and his innocence should be officially proclaimed to the world.

If the Secretary's vindication becomes a generally accepted conclusion, the usefulness of the Senator from Wisconsin to the Senate and the country will, in my opinion, be totally and eternally destroyed.

We do not know whether the Senator's charges are true or false. So far, my judgment has been wholly suspended. But it is high time that some reliable relevant evidence be made a matter of record.

I listened, with the keenest interest and the deepest anxiety to the Senator's first speech in the Senate on the charge of Communism in the Department of State. I even objected to what seemed to me to be an excess of inquiries and interruptions to which the Senator was subjected, because I was impatient to hear every word of his amazing narration. I fully intended to vote with him if he established his case, and support him to the limit of my capacity. It was my fervent hope that, regardless of politics or friendship, punishment—swift and severe—would be inflicted upon any government official who had knowingly kept 205, or any other number of Communists in the Government's service, in which opportunities for traitorous actions are always available.

There has never been any doubt in my mind that communism is the greatest menace to Christianity, democratic government and human freedom that has ever cursed the world. An American official—high or low—who would, for a moment, knowingly retain a Communist in a place of responsibility from which he could betray to a hostile nation all that is dear to the hearts of the American people, ought to be, not in public life, but in the penitentiary or on a gallows as high as Haman built for Mordecai.

Mr. President, it is important to a proper understanding of the merits of

the Senator's charges to know just what he said in his West Virginia speech. For that information let me invoke the assistance of the Wheeling Intelligencer in which the speech appeared on the 10th day of February.

This paper is one of the oldest and most celebrated journals of West Virginia. As long as I can remember, it has been the political bible of the Republicans of my State. Its founder was the late H. C. Ogden, one of the country's most distinguished newspapermen. He died a few years ago, and the Intelligencer, with a dozen other important papers known as the Ogden Chain, descended to his daughters, Mrs. Frances Stubblefield of Charleston, West Virginia, and Mrs. Nutting of Washington, both of whom are outstanding from every desirable point of view. The former is, and long has been, the Republican National Committeewoman for West Virginia.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEELY. Under the will of the late H. C. Ogden, a distinguished lawyer and prominent Republican, Col. Austin Wood, of Wheeling, is the general supervisor of all the Ogden papers—including the Intelligencer. Colonel Wood uniformly insists upon pitiless accuracy and never-failing propriety in the Ogden papers. In these circumstances, it is difficult for me to doubt that the Senator, in his Wheeling speech, used the identical language attributed to him by the Intelligencer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. NEELY. Not at the moment. Later I will yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield for the present.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President this outstanding Republican paper contains the following concerning the Senator's speech. But he declared:

While I cannot take the time to name all the men in the State Department who have been named as members of the Communist Party and members of a spy ring, I have here in my hand a list of 205 that were known to the Secretary as being members of the Communist Party, and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department.

Let me ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], whether in the course of the hearings which have been conducted on this matter there has been adduced any proof that there were 205 Communists in the State Department at any time on, before, or after the 9th day of February, 1950.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator from West Virginia that I have written the Senator from Wisconsin three letters, one by the counsel, I think, and two by myself, and I have sent the counsel to his office three times to get any evidence he might care to offer, for the committee to consider. I have publicly, on the Senate floor on several occasions told the Senate, and I hope the country, that if anybody in America has any evidence which will

sustain these charges, they are welcome to come and present it to the committee. I have said to the committee in public that any evidence tending to sustain the charges which caused the subcommittee to be brought into being would be welcome.

Now, since the Senator from Wisconsin testified in public hearings, I leave it to others to say whether he has offered proof to sustain the newspaper story of 205 Communists now in the State Department and known to the Secretary.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator from Maryland please answer this question yes or no? Has the Senator from Wisconsin given to the committee the names of 205 Communists who are employed in the State Department or who are shaping State Department policy?

Mr. TYDINGS. With some reluctance, I think the question is so far outside committee procedure that I may answer, and say the answer is "No."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin whether he said in his Wheeling speech that he had the names of 205 Communists who, with the knowledge of the Secretary of State, are now employed in the State Department or who are shaping its policy?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say, first, that I have produced evidence only with reference to about 81, but before I am through, if it will make the Senator happy, I may be able to give evidence on more than 205. There is no doubt in the mind of the Senator from Maryland as to what was said. The President received a telegram from me—

Mr. NEELY. That is not my question. I now ask the Senator from Wisconsin whether I correctly understood him on the floor of the Senate, on one occasion, to say that he had not said at any time, at Wheeling or at any other place, that he had the names in his hands, or before him, of 205 Communists who were employed in the Department of State or who were shaping State Department policy.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said I had in my hand a letter from former Secretary Byrnes in which he pointed out that there were 205 men who his loyalty board said should be discharged because they were dangerous to the Government, and that none of them had been discharged. I then called on the President, by telegram, the next day, to find out the names of those 205 persons from the Secretary of State. I told the President I had the names of 57 other dangerous individuals and that he could have those names.

So let us be done with this silly "numbers game." There is no doubt as to the figures. The President received that telegram the next day. His attention was called to Secretary Byrnes' letter. I said I had 57 names which were available to him for the asking. Since that time the names have increased, and I have given the committee the names of and information on the files of over 100. All the committee needs to do now is to get the files. If what I have said is not the truth, we can be sure the President would make those files available.

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator answer yes or no, and then explain? Did the Senator say, in his speech reported in the Wheeling Intelligencer, that:

I have here in my hand a list of 205 that were known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who, nevertheless, are still working and shaping the policy in the State Department.

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to read to the Senator what I said.

Mr. NEELY. No; I want the Senator's simple yes or no answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator want an answer?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I certainly do.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will he be quiet long enough for me to answer him?

I said I had in my hand 57 names of individuals who would appear to be members of or loyal to the Communist Party, but who, nevertheless, were helping to shape our foreign policy.

That is what was said at Wheeling and in other places in the country, and that was called to the Senator's attention—

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator please stop evading and candidly state whether he wrote and said in his Wheeling speech what I have read from the Intelligencer?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not going to talk about the rough uncorrected draft of any speech which someone may have gotten. I did not say I had the names of 205. I said that Mr. Byrnes said, "Here are 205." I said, "Mr. President, get their names." I am not going to discuss any rough draft of any speech. I have told the Senator what was said in that speech. I offered the Senator from Illinois, 2 days later, a transcript of that speech, which he refused.

Mr. NEELY. I insist that the question be answered "Yes" or "No."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to answer further.

Mr. NEELY. I should like to know whether the Senator gave to the Wheeling radio station a speech which contained the language I have read relative to the alleged employment of 205 Communists by the Department of State. Did the Senator say that?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the Senator asks me a question he will have to wait until I can answer it; otherwise, he will not get an answer.

Mr. NEELY. If the Senator will not answer "Yes" or "No," I must assume that he purposes to persist in evading my question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it seems perfectly obvious that the Senator from Wisconsin must have known the story which was carried in this and other newspapers. It is perfectly obvious that he must have known what went on over the air.

Did the Senator from Wisconsin ever try to clear this up, either through channels in West Virginia or over the broadcasting station?

Mr. NEELY. To my regret, I do not know.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the able Senator from South Carolina for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wanted to ask the Senator this question: Did the distinguished Senator from West Virginia read the letter which the distinguished former Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, wrote to the committee?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I have read it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the eminent Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think, in fairness to the former Secretary of State, that his exact words should again be placed in the RECORD. I do not think the Secretary of State said more than this—and I am reading now from his reply:

Of these 4,000 employees the case histories show approximately 3,000 have been subjected to a preliminary examination as a result of which a recommendation against permanent employment has been made in 284 cases by the screening committee to which you refer in your letter.

I do not think the Secretary of State ever said these persons were Communists or were card-carrying Communists or had security risks. I mention that because in many of the cases the only objection to permanent employment was that peace having arrived, wartime employees, aliens to this country, could no longer be retained in the State Department.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I know that Jim Byrnes would never tolerate a Communist around him in any capacity. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from New Mexico recalls the date of the letter.

Mr. ANDERSON. June 26, 1946. The reason I wanted to insert the statement in the RECORD is that former Secretary of State Byrnes presented it to the Cabinet. At that time I was a member of the Cabinet and I heard his statement. I know it was not that they were card-carrying Communists.

Mr. MAYBANK. Since then the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has read the letter?

Mr. NEELY. That is true.

Mr. MYERS and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. NEELY. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Does it not seem strange to the Senator from West Virginia that the Senator from Wisconsin has just admitted that he was reading from a statement made by former Secretary of State Byrnes dated in 1946 to the effect that these people are still on the pay roll of the State Department, and today seems to base his case upon a letter which is 3½ years old?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; strange beyond comprehension. According to the Wheeling Intelligencer, the Senator made a

statement which was entirely different from anything said by Secretary Byrnes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not desire to get involved in this debate. I would appreciate it if a question could be properly propounded to the Senator from Wisconsin and have him answer it either yes or no, because it is not a trick question and can be answered either in one way or another by an honest man.

Mr. McCARTHY. More questions? I thought that if the Senator from Maryland had desired to ask me questions, he had the opportunity to do so. He has had hours, during which he has been cross-examining me in detail.

Mr. TYDINGS. I never cross-examined the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without unanimous consent the Senator from West Virginia cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield to me for a question.

Mr. NEELY. I shall be glad to yield if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that not long ago I asked the distinguished Vice President a parliamentary inquiry, and I wanted recognition for 2 minutes, but the distinguished Senator from Maryland denied me that right.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I said, "Reserving the right to object," and then asked the Senator whether he was going to speak at length. He never gave me a chance to find out.

Mr. NEELY. I hope that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska will not hold me responsible for anything the Senator from Maryland may have done or failed to do.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I hold nothing against the Senator from West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the able Senator from Maryland, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. The question that has been raised is susceptible of a "yes" or "no" answer. I would ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin this question: Did the Senator from Wisconsin give to the newspaperman who wrote the article for the paper a manuscript containing the paragraph which he has read, and did he give to the radio people a manuscript containing the paragraph from which he has read? Certainly he did or did not. I am certainly very glad that the Senate has had the opportunity today to see what the situation is, because I want the Senate to know how difficult it is under some circumstances to extract information from witnesses.

Mr. NEELY. I cannot answer the question of the Senator from Maryland because of my utter inability to obtain

the necessary information from the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator know that the only money which the Senator from Maryland has spent upon investigations was for an investigator whom he sent down to Wheeling, W. Va., to investigate me? The Senator from Maryland has the figures 205 and 57 clearly in mind. I have gone over them with him in detail at least five times, and he has told me at least twice "Now I understand."

Mr. NEELY. My answer to the Senator's question is an emphatic "No."

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator think—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator think that the important issue before the committee today is to take all the evidence which has been presented, regardless of whether it was 10 individuals or 100 or 50, and investigate them?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator agree that the important thing is to take the evidence on Communists and to get rid of those individuals, whether there are 50 or 100? Will the Senator agree that this bickering over whether there were typographical errors in the rough draft given the radio station should stop, and that the important question is to get those Communists out?

Mr. NEELY. Of course, I want to get rid of any known Communist, if such there be, in any branch of the Government without the delay of a single moment or a single heartbeat. But I also want a "yes" or "no" answer to the questions I have asked the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the eminent Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia whether or not, in listening to the debate on the floor this afternoon, he understood that the Senator from Wisconsin had said that the charges as to Communists in the State Department to which he had referred at Wheeling, W. Va., came from the context of a letter written by former Secretary of State Byrnes.

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I heard what the Senator said on that point.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota has asked a question of the Senator from West Virginia, and he is now in the process of answering it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator so understand?

Mr. NEELY. Yes; I did.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator from West Virginia understood the Senator from Wisconsin to say during the debate on the floor this afternoon that instead of the figure 205

as being card-carrying Communists, he said the figure was 57.

Mr. NEELY. I also heard that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator from West Virginia hear his colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia, read two affidavits pertaining to the meeting at Wheeling, W. Va.?

Mr. NEELY. Yes, with unusual interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator from West Virginia feel it was appropriate for the special subcommittee of the Senate making an investigation of these charges to verify once and for all where the truth lies in those figures?

Mr. NEELY. It is my intention to urge that the Tydings committee perform that highly important service, because it is obvious that someone whose identity has not yet been officially determined is lying as deliberately and outrageously as Ananias did just before he was struck dead for his sin. If there are not 205 Communists in the State Department, there are brazen, vile and vicious Ananias abroad in the land. The Tydings committee should mercilessly run down, expose, and without delay bring the guilty to justice—regardless of who they may be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia, in view of the fact that the name of former Secretary of State Byrnes has been brought into this discussion, and his name was brought in on the basis of certain proof that employees in the State Department were being held back from employment by screenings being given to them, whether or not the Senator from West Virginia feels that former Secretary of State Byrnes would have kept on the pay roll of the State Department known Communists or people who he knew were Communists.

Mr. NEELY. If the Senator from Minnesota had served with the distinguished Senator, later Secretary James Byrnes, as many others on this floor have done, he would know that it would have been as impossible for a known Communist to be retained in the Government's service by that outstanding Secretary as it would be for a man to number the days of eternity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want the Senator to know that I hold Mr. Byrnes in the highest regard as a devoted and patriotic citizen, and the purpose of my question was merely to ask the Senator's opinion as to whether or not a man who was a Secretary of State, who lists in a letter a certain number of employees who have been screened out for further examination, would have kept them on the pay roll if he knew them to be, as has been charged, Communists, and the Senator's answer is, obviously, that of course he would not.

Mr. NEELY. That is my unhesitating, unconditional, confident belief and reply. It would have been as impossible for "Jimmy" Byrnes to be guilty of such folly as it would be for dead soldiers to rise from their graves and fight again.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator believe any other inference can be drawn, from the reference made by the Senator from Wisconsin to the letter written by Secretary of State Byrnes, and can any other inference be drawn from the remarks, than that Secretary Byrnes, and that the Secretary of State who followed him, a great Pennsylvanian, George Marshall, knew that Communists were on the pay roll to a certain number? Is not that the plain inference to be drawn from the remarks?

Mr. NEELY. That is obviously true.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. NEELY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have just heard the Senator give very responsive replies to the inquiries of the Senator from Minnesota with regard to Secretary Byrnes. Am I right in assuming that what he has said about Secretary Byrnes goes with equal weight with regard to Secretary Marshall?

Mr. NEELY. Yes, to the fullest possible extent.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I understand that what the Senator has said about Secretary Byrnes and Secretary Marshall goes with equal weight to another great American, Secretary Hull?

Mr. NEELY. Certainly. Both those men are, and always will be, models of patriotism, veracity, and distinguished service. They will ever be as far above suspicion as Caesar wished his wife to be.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I right in assuming that no one in his right mind could doubt the character, the integrity, the patriotism of the present great Secretary of State, Secretary Dean Acheson?

Mr. NEELY. That assumption has my concurrence.

Mr. President, I desire once more to give the Senator from Wisconsin the opportunity to answer "Yes" or "No" my question whether he gave the Wheeling Intelligencer a written copy of a speech which contained the verbatim language I have quoted, and whether he gave a copy of that speech to radio station WWVA on the 9th day of February. Let me entreat the Senator from Wisconsin to answer that question "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. McCARTHY. Is the Senator talking to me?

Mr. NEELY. Yes, to the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY. That was my intention.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me answer—

Mr. NEELY. Once more, will the Senator simply state whether he did or did not hand to the radio station at Wheeling, and to the Wheeling Intelligencer on the 9th day of February written copies of his speech which contained the exact language I have read from the Wheeling paper?

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator be quiet while I answer?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I am sorry, but I cannot hear what the Senator is saying.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will tell the Senator exactly what I gave the radio station, as far as I know. They were given a rough draft of the speech. It is entirely possible—I have not seen the draft since I gave it—that there was an error and that 205 was used in place of 57 instead of in connection with the Byrnes letter, but there is no doubt in anybody's mind—or in the mind of the Senator—that in that speech that night I used the figure 57 as I stated. I said, "I have the names of 57 people in my hand who are either members of or loyal to the Communist Party." The Byrnes letter and the figure 205 contained therein was used to prove how the loyalty program started, and how it was operated.

I pointed out that of 3,000 screened, 284 were labeled as improper for employment. I pointed out that 79 were discharged, leaving 205, and I asked publicly, and I asked the President in a wire immediately thereafter, to ask the Secretary for the names of the 205.

Mr. President, answering the question—

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, the Senator has manifestly determined that he will not answer my question "Yes" or "No." If he cannot say whether he gave the Wheeling Intelligencer and the radio station a copy of the speech which contained the quotation that has been repeated to him again and again, I pity the committee which is endeavoring to obtain from him sufficient evidence to enable it to decide the case which he has sensationally brought to the attention of the Nation and the world. The Senator is an able lawyer and knows the value of responsive answers to important questions. If he presents his evidence to the committee in the manner in which he is resisting my inquiries, the hearing now in progress will be fruitless and never-ending.

Mr. President, men of unquestioned reputation swear that the Senator said precisely what the Intelligencer reported. In such a case as this, a patriot should present his proof. He should not evade or quibble or hide behind others after obtaining thousands of screaming headlines on his own responsibility.

The time has come to submit proof instead of rumor and nonsense in this case. If it is not produced, public opinion ought to sear to oblivion those who are responsible for a Nation-wide clamor that has utterly and foully failed of justification.

I again tell the Senator from Wisconsin: If he will prove the charges he has made against the Secretary of State, I will vote to impeach him and to inflict upon him the severest penalty of the law. I would owe that service not only to myself and to my country but also to my God.

This Nation has been held up to ridicule in every capital of the world as a result of these wild, weird charges—hideous charges that we hire men, known to the Secretary of State to be Communists, to shape the policy of this great and

glorious Republic—Communists who would destroy this Government and all government, wreck all churches, destroy all religions, murder all ministers of the gospel and enslave the world forever.

Mr. President, for ourselves, for our children and for all humanity, let us see to it that the truth and the whole truth about this nationally disgraceful matter is officially ascertained and proclaimed from pole to pole.

I demand that the committee diligently prosecute this case to a final conclusion. I demand that it require the Senator from Wisconsin to produce any scintilla of legal evidence in his possession and if he has none, let the world be informed of that fact now and forever. If it be proved that anyone has, for personal notoriety, political gain, or infamous ends slandered his country, disgraced his government and imperiled the security of the Nation in this—the most critical hour since the creation—let the guilty be scourged from all fellowship with the patriotic and the decent of the land; let him be branded for his crime after the manner of the murderer, Cain; and let him, with his infamy for his only companion and his abomination for his only contemplation, be a wanderer on the face of the earth to the end of his days.

REPORT OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 580)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 6264.)

INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE INFLUENCES IN THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right, if I can secure it now.

Mr. LUCAS. I was about to move that the Senate take a recess, but I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, after all the colloquy that has taken place this afternoon, during nearly 3 hours of time, I should like to make one observation. I think the demand by the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] that the subcommittee proceed to make a thorough investigation, is very timely. Again I wish at this point to read what the resolution calls for:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation as to whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are or have been employed by the Department of State.

Certainly that is squarely along the line of the admonitions so forcefully given to the subcommittee this afternoon by the distinguished junior Sen-

ator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. I agree with the sentiments he expressed. I continue to read from the resolution:

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable, and if said recommendations are to include formal charges of disloyalty against any individual, then the committee, before making said recommendations, shall give said individual open hearings for the purpose of taking evidence or testimony on said charges. In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure, by subpoena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

Mr. President, when the distinguished majority leader this afternoon started the colloquy with many Senators on the Senate floor, he read something from a statement made by Representative KARSTEN. I am told that if an investigation is made, and if the subcommittee subpoenas as witnesses Robert L. Lee, Harris Huston, and another man whose name I do not recall, they will testify that they themselves have seen these FBI loyalty files. Let them testify as to what they saw. I am repeating what has been said. I am not charging anything. If that be true, then at one time at least the loyalty files were opened up to a committee of Congress. The men referred to were working for a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Oh, yes; that was before the so-called Executive order was issued, but what difference does that make? So far as the precedents of the Senate are concerned, it makes not one iota of difference. I suggest to the subcommittee that it follow the procedure suggested by the junior Senator from West Virginia; make an investigation, subpoena the witnesses needed, and ask them what they found. Ask them how many persons have been discharged for disloyalty; ask them all about the matter. Such procedure will throw a considerable amount of light on the case.

Mr. President, it seems to me that what should be done is to carry out the provisions laid down in the resolution. If the subcommittee would conduct as extensive a cross-examination of the witnesses who have been before them as was done of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] this afternoon, a wonderful amount of evidence might be uncovered. But no, double-barreled questions by the wholesale were asked to smear the Senator from Wisconsin, while the questioners are very light on the questions asked in cross-examination of witnesses who have been subpoenaed to appear before the subcommittee. The record shows that to be so.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of the debate this afternoon I again wish to call attention to the provisions of the resolution itself, which goes beyond the Senator from Wisconsin, which provides that investigation shall be made of Communists who are in the State Department today, or who may have been in the State Department. We should be talking about how we are to secure the

loyalty files. We should be talking about subjects which go far beyond the mere question of whether we agree with the Senator from Wisconsin or not. Here we have the resolution directing the subcommittee to act. The resolution is the mandate of the Senate to the subcommittee. With the junior Senator from West Virginia, I believe the American people will want to know what the committee brings in by way of testimony, what kind of investigation the committee makes. They do not want an investigation of the Senator from Wisconsin. They want an investigation to be made of subversive and disloyal persons in the Department of State. It is as simple as that. There can be splurges and bombardments against the Senator from Wisconsin for whatever political reasons Senators may desire, but in the final analysis the people of the United States of America will want to know, and they are entitled to know, what is being done by way of a real investigation into the subject matter covered by the resolution. They want to know what is being done to investigate the question of subversives who are alleged to be in the Government.

Mr. President, I have been waiting all afternoon to secure the floor. While I am on my feet I want to say something else. The distinguished majority leader this afternoon read a letter from a man by the name of Peurifoy. In that letter he charged the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] with making an untruthful statement. I do not believe it is in keeping with the dignity of the United States Senate for a Senator to use a letter of that kind—which I think is much different than a newspaper article—a letter from an official in Government, who attempts to besmirch the name of a Senator. It is perfectly all right to bring such a person before the committee. That person has a perfect right to make any charges he wants to before the committee. But when a Senator reads such a letter into the RECORD, I think he steps into the shoes of the writer of the letter. That is the way I feel about it. So long as I am minority leader, I shall not sit idly by and see a secretary of some Government agency or institution call a Senator of the United States a liar.

I think I was acting within the precedents and rules of the Senate when I called the majority leader to order. I can present many precedents for the action I took. Similar action has been taken when attempts have been made to read into the RECORD telegrams and other documents containing objectionable matter. I did not take the action I did with any motive of disrespect, or for any personal reasons. I wish to go along with the majority leader whenever I can. But I took the action I did because I thought it was beneath the dignity of the United States Senate, and the respect that should be shown for Members of the Senate, to permit an individual to attempt to besmirch the name and the character of a Senator, whether he is on one side of the aisle or the other.

I want to see fair play here. Believe me, Mr. President, every time the motives of a Senator are impugned, I cer-

tainly am going to rise and ask that order be maintained, and then make the point of order, and hope that the point of order will be sustained.

Mr. JENNER and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield first to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I wish to ask the Senator what his impression is of a committee which is acting under a resolution of the Senate to investigate communism in the State Department, and which takes up its time calling Communists before it and then asking those Communists whether they know whether there are any Communists in the State Department.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I might respond to the Senator from Indiana by saying that I think that is not giving to the people of the United States the kind of investigation they expect to be made by that committee of the Senate. That is what I have been talking about. If there had been an exhaustive cross-examination of some of the witnesses who have been permitted to wrap the flag around themselves and talk about how their ancestors came over on the *Mayflower*, and if the committee had gotten down to business and had examined those witnesses, we might have gotten into the record more information than we now have to reveal to the American people.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Nebraska if it is not a little bit like sending Baby Face Nelson to investigate John Dillinger.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a great deal of similarity in that respect, I agree.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator tell us if he knows—or if he does not know, perhaps the majority leader will tell us if he knows—whether the investigating committee has arrived at an opinion as to whether it has legal power to subpoena the files and force their production before the committee?

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator from Missouri asking that question of me?

Mr. DONNELL. Yes, or of the majority leader; either one.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understood the Senator from Maryland to say the other evening, the committee had not determined as to that procedure; in other words, no test had been made. I understand that an executive officer had stated that the Department is keeping the files because of an executive order. Whether or not the committee has complied with the provisions of the resolution, I do not know. I think that is a very pertinent question.

I suppose that in absence of the Senator from Maryland, the distinguished Senator from Missouri should interrogate some other member of the committee, perhaps the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] or any other member of the committee who may be on the floor at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. Then I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, if I may, two questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri that he be permitted to ask questions of the Senator from Connecticut at this time? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DONNELL. I have two questions. In the first place, I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether the direction of Senate Resolution 231 has been complied with, namely:

In the conduct of this study and investigation, the committee is directed to procure, by subpoena, and examine the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and such other agencies against whom charges have been heard.

The second question is whether the committee has arrived at a conclusion as to whether it has legal power to require the production of those files and records on subpoena.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Missouri, insofar as his first question is concerned, I have been informed, as all members of the committee have been informed, that subpoenas were served and that the production of the records was refused; at least, the return was made that the files would not be turned over.

I believe that report was made by the chairman of the subcommittee to the chairman of the full Foreign Relations Committee. It has not been discussed in the Foreign Relations Committee as a whole.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that the Senator from Nebraska was objecting to the reading by my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, of a sentence which appeared in the first paragraph on page 2 of the *Peurifoy* letter.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not seen the letter, and I do not know in what paragraph the statement appears. I am objecting to the words which were used.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The statement is:

Finally, there is no shred of truth to the Senator's flat statement that this man "has, or until recently had, a desk in the State Department."

That is what the Senator was objecting to; is it?

Mr. WHERRY. I was objecting to the fact that Mr. *Peurifoy*, an under secretary in a Government department, said there was no truth in the statement made by a Senator. I do not know anything about the facts, of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is a matter of record that the Senator from Wisconsin charged that Mr. Lattimore has, or until recently had, a desk in the State Department. I believe it is a matter of

record that the Senator from Wisconsin has made that charge.

Mr. WHERRY. That may be true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Nebraska now saying that it is proper for a Senator to charge that a man has a desk in the State Department, but improper for an under secretary of a department to say that that man has not; and is the Senator from Nebraska also saying that it is improper for another Senator to put into the *RECORD* a correction?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I say it is beneath the dignity of the Senate and not in accordance with the respect to which Members of the Senate are entitled to let an under secretary of any department charge—either in a letter or by oral statement—a Senator with being untruthful. Such persons have a perfect right to come before the subcommittee and present their case. If it is a question of a decision, they can present the facts, and then let the committee decide.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am answering the Senator's question now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

Mr. WHERRY. But regardless of what the letter was about or regardless of what the Senator from Wisconsin did, or anything else, I think it is time to call a halt, because indirectly such action by a department official impugns the motives of a Senator—when it is said that a Senator is untruthful. I take that position regardless of the merits of the case, for I myself do not know about the merits.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois again.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that it is proper for a Senator to make charges against a department or members of a department, but improper for the members of that department to say that the charges are false?

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Illinois has asked that question once, but I shall answer it again, so that there will be no question about my sincerity or my belief regarding the matter.

I say I think it is entirely improper for an under secretary to make such a statement either in writing or orally, because I feel that it impugns the motives of a Senator of the United States. That is No. 1.

No. 2 is this: I do not know anything about the merits of the case. I do not know who is right or who is wrong. But if we are to preserve the dignity of the United States Senate and the respect for Members of the Senate, I think the majority of the Senate, just as quickly as the minority, must not permit such a thing to happen.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator from Nebraska think it impugns the motives of the President for a Senator to charge that the President of the United States

has knowledge of Communists in the State Department, which charge was made this afternoon by the Senator from Wisconsin on this floor?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to go into that kind of an argument, I will say that I do not like to have anyone accuse anyone else of being a Communist; but one of the most severe blows which I have ever had to take was when the President charged the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] with being of assistance to and agents of the Kremlin. What do Senators think of that? Of course they do not like it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; if the Senator has anything more to say after that, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator mean that that statement is such that it should stop us?

Mr. WHERRY. I think that statement by the President is the most unwarranted and most irresponsible statement ever made by a President of the United States; yes, sir. The President of the United States has no corner on loyalty or truthfulness or patriotism, if you please.

I respect the President; I respect the honor of the office of the President, as I said the other evening in my remarks. But I wish to tell the Senator that when any man who is the head of this Government charges a Senator in the way that the President has charged several of us, then I submit that such a statement is a very excessive statement.

So far as concerns comparing that statement with anything else which has been said by someone else, I will let the Senator from Pennsylvania do that for himself.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. I was merely asking the Senator about the comparison to be made when the Senator from Illinois was almost charged with misconduct because he read on the floor of the Senate a statement which indicates that the Senator from Wisconsin has not told the truth. Does not the Senator from Nebraska think that the Senator from Wisconsin himself certainly is not acting entirely properly when he charges the President of the United States—and makes the charge here on the floor of the Senate—with knowing that there are Communists in the State Department?

In other words, if it is good for one, is not it good for the other?

Mr. WHERRY. I have already answered that question.

I wish to make it perfectly clear, also, that I have all the respect in the world for the Senator from Illinois. I made it plain this afternoon when I cited the precedents with respect to reading telegrams into the RECORD, such as occurred when the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] was taken from the floor. These are precedents, believe me, which I think

would make out of order the reading of messages or letters containing vicious statements indirectly impugning the motives of a Senator of the United States. Possibly the Senator may reply by saying there are precedents holding to the contrary, and if so, that is all right. It may be said it is all right to quote from newspapers. I suppose that is true. Things are twisted in the newspapers at times. But here is a communication from an official, a Deputy Under Secretary of State, which to my mind was used by the majority leader—to do what? To charge the Senator from Wisconsin with making an untrue statement.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator think there should be a denial, if the statement is not true?

Mr. WHERRY. I think its use in this manner is a violation of the Senate rules, and that any Senator should be called to order who uses it in such manner.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator said it was a violation of the rules, and I was called to order. But the Senate did not sustain the Senator from Nebraska, because the Senate voted to allow the Senator from Illinois to proceed in order; otherwise I should have lost the floor. So what the Senator is talking about is merely so much nonsense.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I still have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Illinois. Let me tell the Senator something now.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate sustained me in calling the Senator from Illinois to order. I would have had no objection to the Senator proceeding; in fact, I would have been the first man to move to allow the Senator to proceed in order, provided the Senator would proceed in order.

Mr. LUCAS. I could make a point of order against the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course the Senator could.

Mr. LUCAS. And under the rule, the Senator would have to take his seat. I would not be out of order, either.

Mr. WHERRY. I have the floor. I should like to answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is very welcome.

Mr. WHERRY. Naturally, after a Senator is called to order, if a motion is made that he be permitted to proceed in order, I would be the first to vote in favor of it. But I do have in mind as a precedent a case in which a letter was used in an indirect way to impugn the motives of a Senator. I can show the precedent. I think it vindicates the position of the minority leader. I believe every Member of the Senate should cooperate to promote respect for the rules and to preserve the dignity of the United States Senate.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MYERS. I merely wondered what the Senator thought the State Department should do, if they felt, in their opinion, that the Senator from Wisconsin had not been accurate in the statement he made.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the proper procedure would be for the committee to invite Mr. Peurifoy to appear and testify, and to let him state in the record the position of the Department in any way he desires. That should be his privilege. I think the minority counsel should be permitted to cross-examine the witnesses, and those who are interested ought to help in the investigation to determine whether there is anything to the charges, so that the question may be cleared up. If there is anything to them, I think the American people want to know the truth; and I have a feeling that that is what is going to happen—the American people are going to insist on getting the truth.

Mr. MYERS. They are going to get the truth.

Mr. WHERRY. The sooner we quit trying the Senator from Wisconsin and begin trying those we are supposed to try, just that much more quickly will we get the job done.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether he regards it to be of very high importance that the subcommittee determine whether or not it has the legal power to compel the production of the loyalty and employment files and records of the Government employees in the Department of State?

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question in a moment, if I can get him to return to the Senate Chamber. He has stepped out.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from Missouri is asking me, I may say I certainly think so, and I think when we get the files it would stop much bickering of the kind we have had, about trying the Senator from Wisconsin. We would ascertain what is in the files. I think the committee ought to exert every effort to carry out its mandate and to get the files if possible, regardless of what may be necessary in order to obtain them.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. Let me first say, in further answer, that as I understand the resolution it only provides that the committee shall see the files; it does not call for their public disclosure. I want to tell the Senator what I said a few moments ago, that the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the House saw the files with reference to many of these names, I understand. The Senate committee is now foreclosed from seeing the very files which were seen by another committee in 1947.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Will the Senator permit me, by unanimous consent, to address one further question to the Senator from Connecticut, if the Senator from Connecticut will be kind enough to answer it?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri that he be permitted to inquire of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that I am not sure I understood his answer to my second question. I wanted to be certain that I have it right. The second question I asked him was in substance this: Has the committee, which is acting under the terms of Senate Resolution 231, arrived at a conclusion as to whether it has or has not the legal power to require by subpoena the production for examination by the committee of the complete loyalty and employment files and records of all the Government employees in the Department of State and other agencies against whom charges have been made? Has the committee made a determination of what is its legal right to enforce the subpoenas which it has issued?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the subcommittee authorized the chairman of the subcommittee to report to the chairman of the full committee for the full committee's consideration the refusal to comply with the subpoena. If the Senator is asking me as a member of the subcommittee as to what my opinion is as to the right of this committee or of the Senate to compel the Executive to give up his papers, I shall have to reply, I am of opinion that the Senate cannot enforce compliance with the subpoena. However, the Senator from Connecticut is only one member of the subcommittee. I was there when the determination was made to report the fact to the full committee. There was no extensive argument on the legal question. I rather think that that was reserved for the session of the full committee. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. DONNELL. I appreciate very much the answer the Senator has made. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield, to permit me, with unanimous consent, to ask another question of the Senator from Connecticut?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I have very great regard for the legal opinion of the Senator from Connecticut, and I am very glad to have it. I wanted to ask him, however, whether to his knowledge it has even been decided clearly, or at all, by the Supreme Court of the United States whether a subpoena issued under the direction of such a resolution as this, or any subpoena issued with due authority from the Senate, can or cannot be enforced, to require the produc-

tion for the examination solely by the committee of the records of the Department of State or other executive department? Has the Senator ascertained what have been the rulings of the Supreme Court, if any, on that question?

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator that during the Eightieth Congress the only veto of the President of the United States which was sustained was the veto of a bill introduced by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] which would have compelled the President to submit, with the nomination of a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, the FBI report. That bill was passed on a voice vote, and the President's veto was sustained in the Senate. During the course of that debate, a very extensive argument took place, with the full marshaling of the precedents. I refer the Senator to a reading of that debate. I think it will be most illuminating to him. At least, it was sufficient to convince more than one-third of the Senators of the correctness of the view that we do not have the power.

I am glad to advert to that, because in that debate I made the statement then that I was taking the position that the Senate, as a coordinate branch of the Government, had no legal power to compel the President of the United States to surrender documents in the files of the executive department. I said then, and I reiterate now, that I was making that statement, not because there was a Democrat in the White House, because I said that if he were a Republican, I would take exactly the same position. I merely wanted the Senate to know that my position was made clear, back in the Eightieth Congress, as to this constitutional question.

I have not the time, and I am sure the Senator from Missouri does not want to engage in any long debate as to constitutionality at this time. I think it may well come, after the full committee considers it, to a full-dress debate in the Senate. I am just as certain as I can be, as a lawyer, that the Senate cannot compel the President of the United States to produce papers, any more than a judge of the district court in a recent case in the District of Columbia was able to compel the House of Representatives to produce committee records in the court. The House finally voted to send them down voluntarily, but it specifically pointed out that it was not complying with any subpoena at all.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, on two occasions the Senator from Connecticut has found it his disagreeable duty to comment upon the progress of the investigation. I assure the Senator from Nebraska that it is by all odds the most disagreeable appointment which the Senator from Connecticut has had in his term as a Senator. I very much regret the aspersions which have been cast upon both the earnestness and the competency of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I will, possibly immodestly, match my competency against that of the Senator from Nebraska in examining any witness. I dare say I have had more experience at it than he has had. It happens that I examine witnesses after the junior Senator from Iowa examines them before the committee, and I want to say that I resent the slur which has been cast on the junior Senator from Iowa, who has been most diligent in his duty, and who has cross-examined witnesses most skillfully, hour after hour.

I invite attention to the fact that representatives of the press, who are now reporting these proceedings of the subcommittee, are also in the hearing room, and they know and have reported to the country fully and fairly what has gone on. No effort by the Senator from Nebraska to besmirch the committee, to mislead the country as to the committee's intentions in what it is trying to do in the way of performing its duties, will make any very lasting impression.

I regret very much, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators have sought, it seems to me, to scandalize the committee. What is said here from day to day in an effort to sway the opinion of the country, in my opinion, will have as an end result very little effect. The thing which is going to count, when it is all over, is the report which the committee will make to the Senate and to the Nation. It is on the result that the committee will be judged.

I repeat that I do not propose to be drawn into any day-by-day running debate on this question. I say to the Senators on the other side of the aisle, including the minority leader, and I say to the press, and, therefore, to the Nation, that I have only one objective, and that is to sit as a judge in this proceeding, and, when all the evidence is in, render my opinion.

I offer only one reservation, Mr. President, to that very firm intention on my part, and that is that if an attack is made upon the honor or integrity of the Senator from Connecticut, outside this body or inside the Senate, the Senator from Connecticut may well have to take the floor to denounce that attack. With that reservation, however, Mr. President, I assure the Senate and the country—and I think I speak for the other four members of the subcommittee—that we have only one desire, and that is to sift these charges and find out the truth, because, if the charges are true, the country should know it, and if they are false, the country should know it. That is the issue. That is what we are going to determine; that is what we are going to be judged by. Let that day come, and the Senator from Connecticut will be able to meet it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Connecticut on the fair statement he has made, especially with reference to the charge that the committee is not doing the job that it should do. I was going to comment on what the Senator from Nebraska said regarding the subcommittee not doing anything. It was a strange statement for the Senator from Nebraska to make, because he had just told the Senate and

the country how he wanted to protect the dignity of the United States Senate. He chastised me because I read a statement into the RECORD. He said the motives of a Senator had been impugned. He was standing at the portals of the Senate, so to speak, to protect this great deliberative body. Then he proceeds to smear one of the group of five Senators on a subcommittee which has the most important and most difficult task, probably, in the history of the United States Senate.

I do not blame the Senator from Nebraska for talking about files; I do not blame him for trying to get away from what he started here today. The Senator from Nebraska has not talked about what happened in Wheeling, W. Va. I have the notion the Senator from Nebraska pretty well believes what those affidavits said with respect to the original charge which was made in Wheeling, W. Va., by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. That, Mr. President, is the reason why we are talking here this afternoon. The charge was made in Wheeling, W. Va., by the Senator from Wisconsin, according to affidavits presented this afternoon, that there were 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department; and not only that, but that Secretary Acheson knew they were there.

Talk about a Senator of the United States slurring someone; talk about the dignity of United States Senators, when the Senator speaks in such language of a Cabinet officer. Yet, on the floor of the Senate today he read into the RECORD exactly what he said he said, which is at odds with what the affidavits show.

We were unable, all afternoon, to get the Senator from Wisconsin to answer the simple question whether he did or whether he did not make the statement referred to.

The Senator from Nebraska talks about politics in this matter. I wonder who started the political angle, Mr. President. It was in Wheeling, W. Va., when the Senator from Wisconsin was on a Republican speech-making tour, that he made the charge that there were 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. He can try to get away from it if he wants to. Senators on the other side of the aisle did not rise to defend the situation this afternoon, other than the Senator from Wisconsin, and he could not defend himself. The statement that there are 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department is important, Mr. President; it is the basis of the proceedings which have ensued.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Senator from Wisconsin made the statement. I suppose some Senator will call me down for saying that, because the statement does not jibe with what the Senator said he said.

Mr. President, the investigation is proceeding. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] said this afternoon, "Let the chips fall where they may." The Senator from Illinois does not want to protect anyone. When the Senator from Wisconsin speaks about smearing, whom is he smearing?

Let me ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. Does not a Cabinet officer

have any standing at all in this country? Does not the President of the United States have any standing at all in this country? The Senator from Wisconsin said on the floor of the Senate that the President knew of 57 Communists in the State Department. Why, Mr. President, talk about smearing the Senator from Wisconsin? No one wants to smear the Senator from Wisconsin. He smeared himself all through this thing, from beginning to end. The Senator from Wisconsin is a good lawyer, and he should have known better. I predict, Mr. President, that the Senator from Wisconsin cannot prove or will not be able to prove a single allegation that was made in his speech in Reno, Nev., or in his speech at Wheeling, W. Va., with respect to 205 card-carrying Communists in the State Department. If he does—and I want the committee to go to the bottom of it—I will be the first one to join hands with the Senator from Wisconsin and tell him he is the hero of the hour, and that he will be, Mr. President, if he proves it. But if he does not, if he does not make good on that statement which startled this country and startled every free country in the world, as well as Communist countries, then, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia said this afternoon, the public will take care of that situation in due course.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield, Mr. President.

INVESTIGATION OF GAMBLING AND RACKETEERING ACTIVITIES—EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, yesterday when Senate Resolution 202 was read for the information of the Senate, I referred to a joint resolution, which was also read into the RECORD for the information of the Senate. At that time I gave notice that if Senate Resolution 202 was adopted, I would immediately introduce the joint resolution. The purpose of the joint resolution, Mr. President, is to enable the special committee to pay up to \$17,500 for chief counsel, and not to exceed \$12,500 for associate counsel, as well as to exempt counsel from the provisions of the civil-service statute. They are the usual provisions in such cases. I have spoken to the majority leader, to the minority leader, and to the distinguished Senator from Missouri about the resolution, and I understand they have no objection to it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to introduce the resolution and have it considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 176), to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to attorneys employed by the special Senate committee in connection with the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, Eighty-first Congress, was read the first time by title, and the second time at length as follows:

Resolved, etc., That service or employment of any person as an attorney on a temporary basis to assist the special Senate Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, in the investigation ordered by Senate Resolution 202, agreed to on May 3, 1950, shall

not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

Sec. 2. Such special Senate Committee is authorized to employ a chief counsel at a salary not to exceed \$17,500 per annum and an associate counsel at a salary not to exceed \$12,500 to be paid out of any funds available for the payment of the expenses of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator if the joint resolution does not represent a new departure by way of salaries for counsel of senatorial committees?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; it provides more than counsel of committees are usually paid, but it came about at the suggestion of the majority leader, who said he wanted the committee which was set up to have the very best counsel that might be available.

Mr. McMAHON. I commend the Senator from Tennessee, because unless proper counsel and assistant counsel are engaged in an investigation of this kind the committee might find itself very much at a disadvantage. I wish to say that if we are going to pay attorneys from the outside in accordance with that scale, then it is time we, too, should follow the precedent. Therefore I am delighted with what the Senator has done.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Connecticut, and I wish to say that this afternoon when the Senator was making a speech for 1 or 2 minutes in support of the resolution which was before the Senate, I asked him to yield, but before he could yield his time had expired. I wanted at that time to express my thanks to the senior Senator from Connecticut for his support of the resolution all the way through. He has rendered a great deal more service than many people know about in helping to secure a place for the consideration of both the resolution and the substitute in the Democratic policy committee, and I am very grateful for the assistance and help rendered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on the joint resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Am I to understand that the salaries that are proposed to be paid to counsel are more than the usual salaries paid to counsel for such purposes?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I think there have been some exceptions in the case of some senatorial committees.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason I asked the question is that the joint resolution

never came before the Committee on Rules and Administration. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; but I may say—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. The only reason I am interested in it is I do not like a precedent to be established by providing salaries which are out of line with the recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration. So I ask the Senator this question: Has the distinguished Senator taken it up with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have discussed it with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it correct to say that the joint resolution did not go to the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator tell me once again what the top salary is which is proposed to be paid to counsel under the joint resolution?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The resolution authorizes the committee to pay counsel up to \$17,500. That is to say, it is not to exceed that amount. Of course, that does not mean that counsel will be paid that sum. The Senator should consider that if we are to get a top-flight man, he will have to give up what he is doing and of course abandon his law practice for a short time. He would be paid at that rate. Also, perhaps he may not live in Washington and it would be necessary under those circumstances for him to sustain himself here.

Mr. WHERRY. The majority leader served for a long time on the committee which handled the contingent expenses of the Senate. I shall not raise a question about this matter, because if it was unanimously agreed to, and the joint resolution is passed, it is agreeable to me. However, I am pointing out that the resolution did not go before the Committee on Rules and Administration, and there is no breakdown for the budget. I, too, wish the committee to have the kind of counsel they need. I want them to have able counsel. However, I desire to point out that because this resolution is brought up late at night and has not gone through the Committee on Rules and Administration, we may be establishing a practice which is different from the usual practice pertaining to salaries ordinarily paid, a question on which the Committee on Rules and Administration has acted, at least during this Congress and I think during other Congresses as well. I am not objecting, but I should like the Record to show that even though this action is taken by unanimous consent it does not establish a precedent, in view of the fact that the resolution never went to the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This resolution would not go to that committee. This is a joint resolution, which must go to the House, must be acted upon by the House, and must be approved by the President, because it changes the law with reference to compensation.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree entirely with the statement of the Chair, but I submit, as the President of the Senate well knows, that there are certain provisions

and rules of the Senate which provide that a breakdown shall be submitted with a resolution, the purpose of it being to have a review of it by the Committee on Rules and Administration. This was not done in the case of the substitute resolution agreed to earlier today, but it was done in the case of the original resolution, as I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That applies to a Senate resolution, not to a joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas H. Lockett, of Kentucky, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Carl Breuer, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Kenneth C. Beede, of Massachusetts.
Charles C. Sundell, of Minnesota.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Frederick L. Jochem, of Wisconsin.
George H. Reese, of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Mrs. Frances H. Baker, of Alabama.
Phillip I. La Sage, of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Margaret R. Parkin, of Ohio.

Lloyd A. Free, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman James P. Rasmussen, Jr. (Naval Academy), to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950:

Emil R. Borgers	Alexander M. McDougal
Wenzell B. Bryant	Richard M. Regan
John P. Donovan	Charles L. Sweeney, Jr.
William F. Gerold	John H. Thorp
Ralph H. Henty, Jr.	Albert R. Knotts, Jr.
Kothschild H. Holden	

Richard G. Williams (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950:

James A. Dardick	John P. Plunkett
Johan S. Gestson	Henry F. Schlueter
Kenneth C. Johnson	Roderick M. Stewart
Theodore H. Kruse	Taylor J. Tucker
Robert D. Morse	Anthony H. Winchell
Richard E. Packard	

Norman F. Lattin (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps, as previously nominated.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, from the 2d day of June 1950, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated:

Phillip B. Ezell	Albert E. Shaw, Jr.
Richard D. Flynn	Paul J. Uhlig
Helge R. Hukari	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Homer S. Arnold	William F. Hughes
Edward W. Bird	Roger G. Ireland
Louis F. Brignac, Jr.	Melvin A. Kutschbach
Robert J. Cales	John W. McAllister
Charles M. Callis	James L. May
Halvard J. Davidson	William R. Moore
Thomas F. Dillon	Benjamin P. Owens
Malcolm D. Dinges, Jr.	Earl Peterson
Owen W. Doyle	David L. Spence
Frank L. Golbranson	Richard C. Stevens
John H. Griffin	Francis J. Sweeney
David H. Hosp	Winston F. Whipple
James R. Householder	McClure Wilson

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Robert W. Elliott, Jr.
William A. Ruel
Chester H. Tiberil

Henry B. Wilson (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy.

Joan Rhodarmar to be an ensign in the Nurse Corps of the Navy.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Lewis D. Williams

LIEUTENANT

Sidney H. Cohen

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Loy T. Brown
Francis L. Giknis
Charles H. Howarth

The following-named officer (woman) to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Norman C. Furtos

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Marjorie C. Chilcott

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the grade of corps indicated:

COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS

Harry L. Day

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in and by whom we live and move and have our being, there is no one unto whom we may draw nigh with such confidence.

There is no one who understands our needs so perfectly; no one unto whom we may unburden our hearts so completely; no one of whom we may ask so much; no one so willing to grant our requests

and give us strength and victory in every struggle for truth and righteousness.

Help us to believe and know and feel that Thou art seeking to be our counselor and guide in all that we think and say and do. We humbly confess that we are often so self-willed and so unlike Thee in thought and word and deed.

We pray that our plans and purposes during this day may be a clear and glorious testimony that we are striving to mediate to all mankind the blessings of freedom and peace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Mr. JACKSON of California (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Journal be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not like to begin entertaining that request unless the Journal be very long; its reading will take but a moment.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 27, 1950:

H. R. 3462. An act for the relief of Walter J. O'Toole;

H. R. 3769. An act for the relief of Doris M. Faulkner;

H. R. 3924. An act for the relief of Dr. T. F. Harrison;

H. R. 4502. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain easement near Fort Belvoir, Va., in exchange for another easement elsewhere on the same property;

H. R. 5704. An act for the relief of Janis Shimada; and

H. R. 6093. An act for the relief of Masami Hiroya and Alko Hiroya.

On April 28, 1950:

H. R. 33. An act to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933;

H. R. 1726. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Hot Springs, Ark., a perpetual easement for the construction and operation of a water-main pipe line;

H. R. 2554. An act to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act of 1932;

H. R. 3010. An act for the relief of Walter E. Parks;

H. R. 3138. An act for the relief of Arthur Holbert; the estate of Ernest L. Gass, deceased; and the estate of James L. Thomas, deceased;

H. R. 4070. An act to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah;

H. R. 4316. An act to repeal the authority to assess certain owners of nonmilitary buildings situated within the limits of the Fort Monroe Military Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4380. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Emma Hay;

H. R. 5753. An act for the relief of Jean Clark;

H. R. 5921. An act to terminate lump-sum benefits provided by law to certain Reserve officers of the Navy and Air Force;

H. R. 6282. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elvior Anne-Britt Jedlund;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Johnny Nielsen;

H. R. 6345. An act for the relief of Mrs. Raymond Schaffer, Jr.;

H. R. 6475. An act to amend the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 to provide for the consideration of claims for the payment of certain postal notes filed later than 1 year from the last day of the month of issue;

H. R. 6694. An act for the relief of Ervin Haas and Leno Vescovi; and

H. R. 6695. An act for the relief of Edgar F. Russell, Lillian V. Russell, his wife; and Bessie R. Ward.

On April 29, 1950:

H. R. 715. An act for the relief of Manual Uribe;

H. R. 1487. An act for the relief of Lt. (sg) Giacomo Falco;

H. R. 1871. An act for the relief of Hilde Flint;

H. R. 2591. An act for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur;

H. R. 3150. An act to revise and repeal certain acts relating to rules of survey to permit departures from the system of rectangular survey when necessary on all public lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3482. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Canadian River by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico;

H. R. 3771. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Gulbenkian;

H. R. 4408. An act to amend the act, approved May 27, 1924, entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, United States Park Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," so as to grant rights to members of the United States Park Police force commensurate with the rights granted to members of Metropolitan Police force as to time off from duty;

H. R. 4285. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1946, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade, and compensation certain employees in the postal field service who are veterans of World War II;

H. R. 4289. An act to require settlers on public lands in Alaska to record notice of their settlement claims in the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4959. An act to reimburse the Fisher Contracting Co.;

H. R. 6003. An act for the relief of Beulah L. White, widow of John E. White;

H. R. 6539. An act to amend Public Law 626, Eightieth Congress, relating to the Army Institute of Pathology Building; and

H. R. 6696. An act for the relief of Lawrence B. Williams and his wife, Viva Craig Williams.

On May 1, 1950:

H. R. 1600. An act for the relief of Gustav Schilbred.

On May 2, 1950:

H. R. 2895. An act to authorize the sale of select base material at the Fort Benning Military Reservation, to Muscogee County, State of Georgia, for use on county roads;

H. R. 6354. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; and

H. R. 7846. An act to amend title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

HIS EXCELLENCY LIAQUAT ALI KHAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, May 4, 1950, it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to declare a recess in order that the House may receive His Excellency Liaquat Ali Khan, the Prime Minister of Pakistan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 580)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948, I transmit herewith the report of the War Claims Commission required by that section. In the absence of a thorough review by interested departments and agencies, the report should be considered as representing only the views of the War Claims Commission and not my own views or those of the executive branch as a whole.

The intent of section 8 of the War Claims Act was clearly to provide for a thorough study and evaluation of all of the many types of claims arising from World War II so that legislation dealing with the war-claims problem could be considered as a whole rather than approached on a piecemeal basis.

However, as the Commission points out in the opening paragraphs of its report, it has not had sufficient time to make the kind of study intended. While making certain specific legislative recommendations, the Commission was unable to be equally specific in other areas. Thus, Congress is still not provided with a comprehensive analysis of the total war-claims problem which is needed in order to make intelligent decisions in regard to individual types of claims. Such an analysis cannot be completed by the Commission without several more months of intensive study.

Under these circumstances, I recommend that legislation dealing with additional types of claims be limited at this session of Congress to that which may be necessary to enable the Commission to develop comprehensive recommendations as to what claims should be authorized in legislation and what the standards of eligibility should be. These recommendations should be submitted to me in time for full consideration by other interested departments and agencies and preparation of a coordinated set of recommendations from the executive branch to the Congress early in the next session of the Congress.

In the meantime, the Commission will, of course, proceed to adjudicate and pay those claims which have already been authorized by the Congress in the War Claims Act of 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 3, 1950.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN RIVER AND HARBOR WORK

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1968)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 85, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 156, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 7, lines 19 and 20, strike out "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated July 13, 1949;" and insert in lieu thereof the following, "Senate Document Numbered 117, Eighty-first Congress; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$21,300,000 for the initial and partial accomplishment of the project;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 8, line 2, strike out the figure "\$89,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$80,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 11, lines 9, 10, and 11, strike out the words "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949;"; and insert in lieu thereof "House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-first Congress;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 15, line 14, change the date "June 30, 1949" to "June 30, 1950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 22, line 22, after the comma, insert the following: "consisting of approximately

one thousand and nine hundred linear feet of pressure conduit and seven hundred feet of earth dike"; and, on line 24, delete the period at the end of the sentence and substitute a comma in lieu thereof and add the following: "Provided, That the provisions of local cooperation applicable to the Hartford, Connecticut, project heretofore authorized, as amended, are applicable to this modification at an estimated cost to local interests of \$150,000;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 24, line 6, change the figure "\$68,377,000" to "\$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 30, line 3, strike out the comma after the word "times"; line 4, strike out the words "sixty-nine thousand acre-feet of"; line 5, strike out the period at the end of the sentence and add the following: "as authorized by existing law;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 36, line 12, after the comma following "1948", insert the following: "in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers contained in House Document Numbered 185, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 2, change the period to a comma and add the following: "as set forth in House Document Numbered 243, Eighty-first Congress;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 8, strike out the following: "dated September 12, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "as contained in House Document Numbered 530, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 37, line 20, after the comma following "1949", insert the following: "and the Chief of Engineers in his report dated December 12, 1949;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 38, line 24, strike out the following: "dated June 27, 1948" and insert in lieu thereof "as contained in House Document Numbered 367, Eighty-first Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 39, line 15, after the comma following "1949", insert the following: "and as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report dated November 15, 1949;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 89 through 106, inclusive: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 89 through 106, inclusive, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the language in the said amendments and in lieu thereof, on page 45, after line 10, add the following paragraphs:

"In addition to previous authorizations and authorizations herein, the projects listed below for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin (including the Willamette River Basin) substantially in accordance with the plans recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949, and approved in the letter dated February 1, 1950, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for construction by the Corps of Engineers, both contained in House Document Numbered 531, Eighty-first Congress, second session, are hereby approved, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$75,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of those projects and for the continued prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Willamette River Basin approved in the Act of June 28, 1938, as amended and supplemented by subsequent acts of Congress:

"Power facilities at Lookout Point Dam, Middle Fork of the Willamette River, Oregon.

"Hills Creek Dam, Middle Fork of Willamette River, Oregon.

"Dexter re-regulating dam, Middle Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Waldo Lake Tunnel and regulating works, Middle Fork-North Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Fall Creek Dam, Fall Creek, Middle Fork, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Holley Dam, Calapooya River, Oregon.

"Willamette Falls Fish Ladder, Willamette River, Oregon.

"Willamette River channel improvements, bank protection works, and channel clearing and snagging.

"Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Montana.

"Priest Rapids Dam, Columbia River, Washington.

"John Day Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon.

"The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Washington and Oregon.

"Local flood protection project at Pendleton, Oregon, and Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

"Local flood protection projects in the Columbia River Basin, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, provided that with respect to these local flood protection projects the following conditions shall apply:

"(1) Not to exceed \$15,000,000 of this authorization shall be available for these local flood protection projects.

"(2) All of the local flood protection projects undertaken pursuant to this item shall be economically justified prior to construction.

"(3) Local cooperation specified in the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended shall be required."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 147: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 55, line 15, change the figure "\$1,337,000,000" to "\$1,250,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 58, beginning with line 5, strike out all of section 219, and insert on page 49, between lines 20 and 21, the following:

"Arkansas, White and Red River Basins, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Kansas, and Missouri, with a view to developing comprehensive, integrated plans of improvement for navigation, flood control, domestic and municipal water supplies, reclamation and irrigation, development and utilization of hydroelectric power, conservation of soil, forest and fish and wildlife resources, and other beneficial development and utilization of water resources including such consideration of recreation uses, salinity and sediment control, and pollution abatement as may be provided

for under Federal policies and procedures, all to be coordinated with the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Power Commission, other appropriate Federal agencies and with the States, as required by existing law: *Provided*, That Federal projects now constructed and in operation, under construction, authorized for construction, or projects that may be hereafter authorized substantially in accordance with reports currently before or that may hereafter come before the Congress, if in compliance with the first section of an Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and other purposes", approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), shall not be altered, changed, restricted, delayed, retarded, or otherwise impeded or interfered with by reason of this paragraph."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 155: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 70, line 3, change the figure "220" to "219"; and the Senate agree to the same.

WILL M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,

GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
HARRY P. CAIN,
GEO. W. MALONE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5472) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Title I of the bill, Rivers and Harbors, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 65 projects in the amount of \$119,469,975. The Senate by amendments added 29 navigation projects costing \$108,903,150, making a grand total of \$228,373,125 for rivers and harbors. The navigation projects added by the Senate were based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. The conferees feel that they should now be included, since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

Title II of the bill, Flood Control, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 22 new flood-control projects and for 18 modifications of authorized projects in a total amount of \$998,116,200. The Senate, by amendments, added 18 projects and modified or extended 6 projects contained in the House bill in a total amount of \$366,384,000, which includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation

work on the Rio Grande, making a grand total of \$1,334,321,200 for flood control. The new flood-control projects added by the Senate were, as in title I, based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers, but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. As in connection with title I the conferees agree that these new projects should now be included since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

The results of the conference are as follows:

For rivers and harbors the total additional amounts of \$108,903,150, as passed by the Senate, were reduced by agreement among the conferees by \$24,650,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Ouachita and Arkansas Rivers. The total additional amount for rivers and harbors, therefore, included by the Senate and agreed to in conference, is \$84,253,150.

With respect to flood control, the total additional amounts added by the Senate of \$366,384,000, of which \$30,179,000 is for work to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation, were reduced by \$84,630,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Savannah River Basin and the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. The total additional amount, therefore, added by the Senate and agreed to in conference, for flood control, is \$251,575,000.

As the bill passed the House the following projects were included under Title I—Rivers and Harbors:

Items (sec. 101, unless otherwise indicated)

Projects	Document number ¹	Federal cost of new work	Annual maintenance	Projects	Document number ¹	Federal cost of new work	Annual maintenance
Searboro River, Maine, between Prouts Neck and Pine Point.	H. 69, 81st Cong.	\$133,570	\$3,600	Palm Beach, Fla., beach erosion.	H. 772, 80th Cong.	\$7,500	-----
Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the Pool at Biddeford.	H. 49, 81st Cong.	68,700	3,240	Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.	H. 704, 80th Cong.	305,000	\$1,000
Winthrop Beach, Mass., beach-erosion control.	H. 764, 80th Cong.	216,000	(?)	Charlotte Harbor, Fla.	H. 186, 81st Cong.	214,000	(3)
Mystic River, Mass.	H. 645, 80th Cong.	2,908,000	4,000	St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla.	H. 70, 81st Cong.	208,300	4,000
Mattapoisett Harbor, Mass.	H. 664, 80th Cong.	33,000	1,500	Horseshoe Cove, Fla.	H. 106, 81st Cong.	194,000	5,000
Stonington Harbor, Conn.	H. 667, 80th Cong.	34,500	1,500	La Grange Bayou, Fla.	H. 190, 81st Cong.	99,000	2,500
Eightmile River, Conn.	H. 666, 80th Cong.	18,000	1,000	Fly Creek, Fairhope, Ala.	H. 194, 81st Cong.	14,000	2,000
Fire Island Inlet, N. Y.	H. 762, 80th Cong.	228,000	85,000	Pascagoula Harbor, Dog River Cut-off, Miss.	H. 188, 81st Cong.	41,000	(3)
East Chester Creek (Hutchinson River), N. Y.	H. 749, 80th Cong.	664,000	4,800	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma.	H. 758, 79th Cong.	70,000,000	(4)
Jamaica Bay, N. Y.	H. 665, 80th Cong.	377,000	7,500	Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas, vicinity of Port Arthur Bridge.	H. 174, 81st Cong.	609,270	1,000
Arthur Kill, N. Y. and N. J.	H. 223, 81st Cong.	11,591,000	(6)	Galveston Harbor and Channel, Tex. (sea wall).	H. 173, 81st Cong.	5,550,000	(?)
Sandy Hook Bay at Leonardo, N. J.	H. 108, 81st Cong.	45,000	7,500	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in South Galveston Bay, Tex.	H. 196, 81st Cong.	300,000	20,000
Lake Okeleto and Walnut Lake, Anne Arundel County, Md.	H. 712, 80th Cong.	76,000	1,000	Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex.	H. 768, 80th Cong.	-----	-----
Hellens Creek, Calvert County, Md.	H. 663, 80th Cong.	10,400	1,000	Freepore Harbor, Tex.	H. 195, 81st Cong.	356,000	26,000
Governors Run, Calvert County, Md.	H. 670, 80th Cong.	59,450	2,000	Little Bay, Tex.	H. 114, 81st Cong.	\$29,800	3,000
Saint Patricks Creek, Md.	H. 671, 80th Cong.	18,200	4,800	Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.	H. 192, 81st Cong.	3,050,000	60,600
Potomac River and tributaries at and below Washington, D. C., elimination of water-chestnut.	H. 113, 81st Cong.	-----	9,470	Trinity River, at Dallas and Fort Worth, Tex.	H. 242, 81st Cong.	3,410,000	(4)
Kings Creek, Northampton County, Va.	H. 193, 81st Cong.	93,000	9,500	Mississippi River at Hannibal, Mo.	H. 67, 81st Cong.	50,420	1,420
Rappahannock River at Bowlers Wharf, Essex County, Va.	H. 109, 81st Cong.	118,000	2,800	Mississippi River at Davenport, Iowa.	H. 642, 80th Cong.	91,200	100
James River, Va.	H. 191, 81st Cong.	-----	46,000	Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa.	H. 733, 80th Cong.	129,495	900
Inland waterway in vicinity of Fairfield, N. C.	H. 723, 80th Cong.	112,400	(?)	Mississippi River at Clinton, Iowa.	S. 197, 80th Cong.	257,770	-----
Far Creek, N. C.	H. 770, 80th Cong.	80,600	6,000	Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis.	H. 71, 81st Cong.	131,100	1,100
Waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Harbor, N. C., harbor improvement at Marshallberg.	H. 68, 81st Cong.	19,400	750	Hudson Harbor, St. Croix River, Wis.	H. 60, 81st Cong.	29,500	100
Taylor Creek, N. C.	H. 111, 81st Cong.	82,200	4,500	Grand Marais Harbor, Minn.	H. 184, 81st Cong.	58,100	100
Cape Fear River and below Wilmington, N. C.	H. 87, 81st Cong.	1,331,000	(?)	Kenosha Harbor, Wis.	H. 187, 81st Cong.	114,000	1,500
Savannah River, Ga. and S. C.	S. 6, 81st Cong.	3,137,000	236,900	Manistique Harbor, Mich.	H. 760, 80th Cong.	4,500	(?)
Brunswick Harbor, Ga.	H. 110, 81st Cong.	1,532,000	40,000	Grand Marais Harbor, Mich.	H. 751, 80th Cong.	398,000	(?)
Saint Marys River, Ga. and Fla., and North River, Ga.	H. 680, 80th Cong.	918,600	18,000	Detroit River, Mich., Trenton Channel.	S. 30, 81st Cong.	1,356,800	1,000
Fernandina Harbor, Fla.	H. 662, 80th Cong.	242,000	5,000	Toledo Harbor, Ohio.	H. 189, 81st Cong.	329,900	4,000
Saint Augustine Harbor and vicinity, Florida.	H. 133, 81st Cong.	1,892,200	11,600	Redwood City Harbor, Redwood Creek, Calif.	H. 104, 81st Cong.	322,000	14,000
				San Joaquin River and Stockton Channel, Calif.	H. 752, 80th Cong.	4,214,000	(?)
				Westport slough, Oregon.	H. 134, 81st Cong.	112,000	8,500
				Columbia slough, Oregon.	(?)	905,100	16,700
				Christiansted Harbor, St. Croix, V. I.	H. 771, 80th Cong.	261,600	5,000
				Total.		119,469,975	698,480

¹ "H" indicates House document, "S" indicates Senate document.

² None required.

³ No additional maintenance cost.

⁴ Additional authorizations.

⁵ Report of Chief of Engineers dated Dec. 28, 1948.

List of projects added to title I of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:
Items added (sec. 101)

Projects	Document number ¹	Estimated cost	Projects	Document number ¹	Estimated cost
Ash Creek to Saugatuck River, Conn., beach erosion.	H. 454, 81st Cong.	\$203,500	Biloxi Harbor, Miss.	H. 256, 81st Cong.	0
Shrewsbury River, N. J.	H. 285, 81st Cong.	363,000	Ouachita River, Ark. and La.	S. 117, 81st Cong.	\$21,300,000
Waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del.	H. 304, 81st Cong.	85,000	Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.	H. 758, 79th Cong.	\$10,000,000
Twitche Cove, Big Thoroughfare River, and Levering Creek, Md.	H. 340, 81st Cong.	21,000	Mississippi River at Hamburg, Ill.	H. 254, 81st Cong.	50,400
Colonial Beach, Va., beach erosion.	H. 333, 81st Cong.	35,000	Mississippi River at Rock Island, Ill.	H. 257, 81st Cong.	18,600
Quincy Creek, Va.	H. 241, 81st Cong.	116,000	Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va.	S. 100, 81st Cong.	29,238,000
Davis Creek, Va.	H. 309, 81st Cong.	85,000	Bayfield Harbor, Wis.	H. 260, 81st Cong.	119,000
Winter Harbor, Va.	H. 319, 81st Cong.	205,000	Cheboygan River and Harbor, Mich.	H. 269, 81st Cong.	163,000
Channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C.	H. 310, 81st Cong.	860,500	Port Bay, N. Y.	H. 293, 81st Cong.	466,600
Masonboro Inlet to ocean, Cape Fear River, N. C.	H. 341, 81st Cong.	1,980,000	Redondo Beach, Calif.	H. 303, 81st Cong.	3,456,000
Tampa Harbor, Fla.	H. 258, 81st Cong.	7,787,000	San Francisco Harbor and Bay, Calif.	H. 286, 81st Cong.	850,000
Hudson River, Fla.	H. 287, 81st Cong.	258,700	Bake Bay, Columbia River, Wash.	S. 95, 81st Cong.	442,000
Channel and turning basin, Ozona, Fla.	H. 326, 81st Cong.	70,100	Columbia River at Umatilla, Oreg.	H. 531, 81st Cong.	416,250
Gulf, Intracoastal Waterway from Big Lagoon to Pensacola, Fla.	H. 325, 81st Cong.	88,000	Kawaihae Harbor, T. H.	H. 311, 81st Cong.	5,525,500
			Hampton Roads, Norfolk Harbor, Va. (sec. 102)		50,000
			Total		84,253,150

¹ "H." indicates House document, "S" indicates Senate document.

² Increased authorization.

List of projects in bill as passed by the House:

TITLE II—FLOOD CONTROL

Items (sec. 204)

Project	Document number	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects	Project	Document number	New flood-control projects	Increases in authorizations for previously approved projects
Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa.	H. Doc. 113, 80th Cong., 1st sess.		\$6,000,000	South Platte River Basin, Colo.	H. Doc. 669, 80th Cong., 2d sess.	\$26,300,000	
Anacostia River, D. C. and Md.	H. Doc. 202, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	\$4,531,200		Elkhorn River Basin, Nebr.	H. Doc. 215, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	2,428,000	
Savannah River Basin.	H. Doc. 657, 78th Cong., 1st sess.	40,000,000		Mandan, N. Dak.	H. Doc. 204, 79th Cong., 1st sess.		\$76,000
Central and southern Florida.	H. Doc. 643, 80th Cong., 2d sess.	10,000,000		Ohio River Basin.			75,000,000
Red River backwater area.			15,000,000	Orleans, Ind.	H. Doc. 105, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	202,000	
St. Francis River Basin, Mo. and Ark.	H. Doc. 132, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	20,000,000		Bradford, Pa.	S. Doc. 20, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	6,467,000	
Cache River Basin, Ark. and Mo.	S. Doc. 88, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	10,000,000		Wabash River—New Harmony Bridge, Ind. and Ill.	H. Doc. 197, 80th Cong., 1st sess.		500,000
Emergency fund (lower Mississippi River Basin).			5,000,000	Red River of the North Basin.			4,000,000
Lower Mississippi River Basin Authorization.			200,000,000	Rio Grande Basin.			34,000,000
Lake Ponchartrain, La.	(¹)	4,050,000		Santa Ana River, Calif.	H. Doc. 135, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	15,092,000	
Calion, Ark.	H. Doc. 427, 76th Cong., 1st sess.		430,000	Los Angeles and San Gabriel Basin.			40,000,000
Genesee River, N. Y.	H. Doc. 232, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	609,000		Willamette River Basin.			40,000,000
Arkansas River Basin.			15,000,000	Johnson Creek, Oreg.	(¹)	332,000	
Grand (Neosho) River, Okla., Kans., Mo. and Ark.	H. Doc. 442, 80th Cong., 1st sess.	36,220,000		Portland, Oreg.	(²)	14,000,000	
Grand Prairie region and Bayou Meto Basin, Ark.	H. Doc. —, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	6,000,000		Albani Falls, Idaho.	S. Doc. 9, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	31,070,000	
White River Basin.			35,000,000	Lower Columbia River bank protection.	(²)	4,900,000	
Upper Mississippi River Basin.			15,000,000	Modification of existing projects in lower Columbia River.	(²)	14,722,000	
Canton, Mo.	H. Doc. 107, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	1,086,000		Levees along lower Columbia River.	(²)	2,973,000	
Cape Girardeau, Mo.	H. Doc. 204, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	4,756,000		Kawainui swamp, Hawaii.	H. Doc. 214, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	848,000	
Missouri River Basin.			250,000,000				
Yellowstone River, Wyo., Mont. and N. Dak.	H. Doc. 216, 81st Cong., 1st sess.	6,524,000		Total		213,110,000	785,006,000
				Grand total		998,116,200	

² Report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated Feb. 21, 1949 (H. Doc. 531, 81st Cong.).

List of projects added to title II of the bill by Senate amendments to which the House concurred:

Items added (sec. 204): Flood control

Projects	Document number	Estimated Federal cost	Projects	Document number	Estimated Federal cost
Hartford, Conn.		¹ \$239,000	Barbourville, Ky.	H. 345, 81st Cong.	\$1,765,000
Monkey Run at Corning, N. Y.	H. 305, 81st Cong.	12,370,000	Cumberland, Ky.	do.	67,000
Pasquotank River, N. C.	H. 306, 81st Cong.	110,000	Red River of the North Basin.		4,000,000
Hartwell Dam, Savannah River, Ga.	H. 657, 78th Cong.	10,000,000	Rio Grande Basin.		² 5,000,000
Central and southern Florida.		10,000,000	Meadow Valley Wash, Muddy River, Nev.	(²)	1,986,000
Grants Canal, Lake Providence, La.		11,000	Painted Rock Reservoir, Gila River, Ariz.	H. 331, 81st Cong.	25,800,000
Amite River bank protection, Louisiana.		50,000	Humboldt River, Nev.	(¹)	7,679,000
Des Arc, Ark.	H. 485, 81st Cong.	228,000	Sacramento River Basin.		3,500,000
Oklahoma City floodway, Oklahoma.		¹ 10,460,000	Russian River, Calif.	(¹)	11,552,000
Pueblo, Colo.	H. 327, 81st Cong.	209,000	Columbia River Basin, including Willamette River Basin.	H. 531, 81st Cong.	76,000,000
Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River, Okla.	S. 107, 81st Cong.	37,273,000	Eagle Gorge Reservoir, Green River, Wash.	H. 271, 81st Cong.	16,300,000
Illinois River at Beardstown, Ill.	H. 332, 81st Cong.	2,976,000			
Ohio River Basin.		25,000,000	Total		² 251,575,000

¹ Modification of previously authorized project.

² \$30,179,000 of this amount does not include work to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation.

³ Report of Chief of Engineers dated Sept. 12, 1949.

⁴ Reports of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated Apr. 22, 1949.

The following is an explanation of each of the Senate amendments, some of which cover minor amendments:

Amendment No. 1, Winthrop Beach, Mass., beach erosion control: Due to emergency, local interests performed certain work at their own expense, which work was in accordance with the recommended plan for which it is proposed that local interests be reimbursed, such reimbursement not to exceed the cost as if the work had been performed by the Federal Government. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 2, Ash Creek to Saugatuck (area 1), Conn.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers authorizing Federal participation in the amount of one-third of the first cost of protective and improvement measures for Jennings, Sasco Hill, Southport and Burial Hill Beaches, Sherwood Island State Park, and Compo Beach. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$610,500 with the Federal share estimated at \$203,500. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 3, Shrewsbury River, N. J.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a shallow draft channel and turning basin at an estimated cost to the United States of \$363,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 4, waterway from Indian River Inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a channel 6 feet deep from Rehoboth Beach to water of the same depth in Indian River Bay by way of Big Ditch. Estimated cost to United States, \$85,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 5, Twitch Cove, Big Thorougfare River, and Levering Creek, Md.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide modification of the existing project by the provision of an anchorage basin 7 feet deep, 100 feet wide, and 700 feet long, connecting with the existing channel at Ewell and an extension of the existing channel in Levering Creek 6 feet deep, 60 feet wide, and 1,000 feet long. Cost to the United States is \$21,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 6, shore protection at Colonial Beach, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide protective measures at Colonial Beach. Cost to the United States is \$35,000, which is one-third of the total cost of the project. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 7, Quinby Creek, Accomack County, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for a channel 8 feet deep to Quinby Landing with a mooring basin of same depth. Cost to the United States is \$116,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 8, Davis Creek, Mathews County, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a channel 10 feet deep with a mooring basin of the same depth. Cost to the United States is \$85,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 9, Winter Harbor, Mathews County, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a 12-foot channel leading from Chesapeake Bay to a mooring basin of the same depth. Cost to the United States is \$205,000. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 10, channel from Manteo to Oregon Inlet, N. C.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a bar channel 14 feet deep in Pamlico Sound and in Oregon Inlet to and including a turning basin of the same depth and a side channel 12 feet deep from the Manteo-Oregon Inlet Channel in Roanoke Sound to wharves in Mill Creek near Wanchese, including a turning basin. Cost to the United States is \$860,500. House conferees recede.

Amendment No. 11, Masonboro Inlet to Ocean, N. C.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for initial stage construction consisting of a channel 14 feet deep over the ocean bar at Masonboro Inlet thence 12 feet deep to the channel of the inland waterway at Wrightsville by way of Banks and Motte Channels, and a turning basin 15 feet deep on the east side of Banks Channel near the inlet with three 15-pile tie-up dolphins. If experience shows that it is impracticable to maintain the proposed channels and turning basin by dredging alone, a final stage of construction, consisting of jetties on each side of the bar channel across the inlet is proposed. Cost to the United States is \$390,000 for initial stage; \$1,980,000 for final stage. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 12, Palm Beach, Fla., beach erosion control: Correct typographical error.

Amendment No. 13, Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.: A portion of the harbor is maintained by local interests by periodic dredging. The Federal project recommended in House Document 704, Eightieth Congress, provides for extension of the existing turning basin. This extension was required to accommodate increased vessel traffic. Dredges operating in the area under contract to local interests were able to do the work at a saving in cost of mobilization and demobilization of the dredge equipment. The work was so performed in accordance with the project modification. Reimbursement to local interests for the cost of the work performed, not to exceed the sum of \$305,000, is recommended. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 14, Tampa Harbor, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide deepening of Egmont Channel to 36 feet; enlarging Mullet Key Cut to a depth of 34 feet and width of 500 feet; enlarging Tampa Bay, Hillsboro Bay, and Port Tampa Channels to a depth of 34 feet and a width of 400 feet; enlarging Port Tampa turning basin to a depth of 34 feet and a width of 750 feet; deepening Sparkman Channel and Ybor turning basin to 34 feet; revoking the authorized improvement of Alafia River and substituting in lieu thereof a channel 30 feet deep and 230 feet wide from Hillsboro Bay Channel to and including the existing turning basin to be enlarged to a depth of 30 feet, a width of 700 feet, and a length of 1,200 feet. Cost to the United States is \$7,780,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 15, Hudson River, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for a channel 6 feet deep from the Gulf of Mexico to the head of Hudson River. Cost to the United States is \$258,700. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 16, channel and turning basin at Ozona, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide a 6-foot channel from the authorized Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River, Fla., to and including a turning basin 6 feet deep. Cost to the United States is \$70,100. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 17, Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Big Lagoon to Pensacola Bay, Fla.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for abandonment and closure of existing channel between Big Lagoon and Pensacola Bay, and construction of a new channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide from existing channel in Big Lagoon to Pensacola Bay. Cost to United States is \$88,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 18, Biloxi Harbor, Miss.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for assumption by the United States of maintenance to a depth of 6 feet and a width of 40 feet of the existing channel from the main channel in Biloxi Harbor to the entrance of Ott Bayou. Cost to the United States, none for new work. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 19, Ouachita River and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana (S. Doc. No. 117, 81st Cong.): Item adopts project as approved by the Senate providing for modernization of the navigation channel for the Red River to the mouth of the Black River thence from the mouth of the Black River to Camden, Ark., mile 351, on the Ouachita River, to be obtained by lengthening the existing six locks to 525 feet and deepening them to accommodate 9-foot draft navigation, also provides for channel realignment, cut-offs where necessary, rehabilitation of the dams and contraction works. The project also provides for a comprehensive plan of improvement for flood control, power production, and other purposes on the Ouachita River and tributaries, to include, in addition to all existing projects and portions thereof in the basin above the lower end of the levees on the east bank of the Ouachita, the following improvements: (1) Construction of the DeGray multiple-purpose reservoir on Caddo River, and the Murfreesboro flood-control reservoir on Muddy Fork of Little Missouri River; (2) extension of the flood wall at Monroe, La.; (3) construction of a levee and appurtenant works for flood protection of Bawcombville, La.; and (4) channel improvement and closure of high-water outlets on Bayou Bartholomew, Ark. and La., channel improvement on the tributary Pine Bluff outlet canal, construction of an intercepting canal from the head of Harding drain to Bayou Bartholomew, and channel improvements of Deep Bayou and Overflow Creek. Total cost to the United States is \$36,950,000, which includes \$13,900,000 for a 9-foot navigation channel. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to a substitute amendment. The substitute amendment reduces the amount of the authorization as originally proposed by the Senate from \$36,950,000 to \$21,300,000. This authorization will be available for the local protection projects at Bawcombville, Monroe, and Bayou Bartholomew, Pine Bluff outlet canal, Deep Bayou and Overflow Creek; for the DeGray Reservoir and navigation improvements. It is the understanding of the conferees that the Murfreesboro Reservoir will be deferred pending a further showing of the need and justification.

Amendment No. 20, Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Louisiana: The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to same with an amendment which provides for a reduction in the amount authorized. This amendment reduces the Senate figure from \$89,000,000 to \$80,000,000 for the further accomplishment of the approved plan for the Arkansas River and tributaries (H. Doc. No. 758, 79th Cong.), it being the understanding of the conferees that of this amount not to exceed \$30,000,000 may be used for bank stabilization works at any location on the Arkansas and Verdigris Rivers from the mouth of the Arkansas River to Catoosa, Okla.

Amendment No. 21, Trinity River at Dallas and Fort Worth, Tex.: This amendment authorizes the document number to be inserted. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 22, Mississippi boat harbor opposite Hamburg, Ill.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for a small-boat harbor on the Missouri side of the river opposite Hamburg, Ill., with an entrance channel 6 feet deep and appurtenant works. Cost to the United States, \$50,400. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 23, Mississippi River at Rock Island, Ill.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a small-boat harbor in Lake Potter at downstream limits of the city of Rock Island, Ill., by deepening and widening en-

trance channels to the Mississippi River into Lake Potter to a depth of 6 feet and a width of 100 feet. Cost to the United States is \$18,600. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 24, Monongahela River, W. Va. and Pa.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for replacement of locks and dams 12 to 15, inclusive, by two locks and dams of higher lift with single lock chambers having usable dimensions 84 feet by 600 feet; construction of movable crest gates on dam 8 to increase the pool elevation; and construction of a navigable channel 9 feet deep and 300 feet wide from lock and dam 8 to the head of the river and thence of the same depth, and 200 feet wide where attainable, for a distance of about 2.1 miles up Tygart River. Cost to the United States is \$29,238,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 25, Bayfield Harbor, Wis.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide a small-boat harbor by dredging and protective works. Cost to the United States is \$199,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 26, Cheboygan River and Harbor, Mich.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for modifying existing project by deepening the channel and basin to 21 feet. Cost to the United States is \$163,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 27, Port Bay, N. Y.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for channel 8 feet deep from Lake Ontario into Port Bay protected by arrowhead breakwaters. Cost to the United States is \$466,600. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 28, Redondo Beach Harbor, Calif.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for reconstruction of about 1,485 linear feet of the existing breakwater, construction of a 2,800-foot extension of the existing breakwater and a south breakwater 700 feet long; and for maintenance of the entire existing breakwater as reconstructed the breakwater extension, and the south breakwater. Cost to the United States is \$3,456,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 29, San Francisco Harbor and Bay, Calif.: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers for the establishment of a separate project for collection and disposal of debris in the San Francisco Bay area. Cost to the United States is \$850,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 30, Baker Bay, Columbia River, Wash.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for a mooring basin 10 and 12 feet deep, about 20 acres in extent, with protecting breakwaters; and for a west channel 10 feet deep connecting the basin with deep water in Columbia River. Cost to the United States is \$442,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 31, Columbia River at Umatilla, Oreg.: Item as amended, and as recommended by the Chief of Engineers, provides for removal of blocks and boulders between the waterfront at Umatilla, Oreg., and the navigation channel to provide for a depth of 7.5 feet at the present low-water datum. Cost to the United States is \$416,250. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 32, Kawaihae Harbor, Island of Hawaii: Item adopts project recommended by the Chief of Engineers to provide for adoption of a project for the improvement of Kawaihae Harbor to provide for a basin 35 feet deep below mean lower low water and 1,250 feet square with an entrance channel 40 feet deep, 400 feet wide, and approximately 2,900 feet long extending northwestward to deep water in the ocean; and a protective breakwater about 4,400 feet long with maximum crest elevation 13 feet above mean lower low water, of which the seaward 3,200 feet shall be protected by

heavy stone revetment. Cost to the United States is \$5,525,500. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 33, collection and removal of drift in Hampton Roads and the harbors of Norfolk and Newport News, Va.: Item adopts project recommended by Chief of Engineers to provide for the prosecution of a regular program for the collection and removal of drift from the Hampton Roads area as is now being carried out in New York and Baltimore Harbors. Initial cost to the United States is \$50,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 34, Chief Joseph Dam, Columbia River, Wash.: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 35, Kentuck and Otter Slough, Oreg.: This amendment provides authority to the State of Oregon acting through its highway department, and to a local drainage district and county court, to construct, maintain, and operate dams and dikes to control the flow of tidal waters into these sloughs at points suitable to the interest of navigation and in accordance with plans approved by Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army, in accordance with conditions and stipulations which they deem necessary. No cost to the United States is involved. Similar authorizations have been included in previous River and Harbor Acts. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 36: Provides for change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 37, Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River. This amendment would authorize the Chief of Engineers to select the most feasible route as an alternate for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Venice, Fla. It is the understanding of the conferees that it does not eliminate the existing proviso that the cost of the selected route shall not exceed the cost of the original route. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 38, Red Fish Bay, Tex.: This amendment provides for changing the name of the navigation channel and turning basin in Red Fish Bay to Port Mansfield in honor of the late and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Congressman Joseph J. Mansfield. This change is desired by the Governor of Texas, the Texas Legislature, and the citizens of the State. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 39, revision of compilation of preliminary examination, survey and review reports: This amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Army to prepare and transmit to Congress a compilation of these reports, the last previous one having been published as House Document 106, Seventy-sixth Congress. This compilation is of considerable value in the administrative work of the Corps of Engineers and to the congressional committees and the Members of Congress, as well as to other organizations interested in river and harbor and flood-control investigations. It is understood by the conferees that the information is already available and that the only expense will be for printing. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the Senate amendment and concur to same with an amendment to bring the date of the compilation up to June 30, 1950, in lieu of June 30, 1949, in view of the lapse of time since the bill passed the House.

Amendment No. 40: This amendment authorizes the conveyance of bridges owned by the United States and maintained and operated by the Corps of Engineers to local interests and will operate to effect a considerable saving to the Federal Government. The House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 41: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 42: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Round

Pond Harbor, Maine. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 43: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Bass Harbor, Maine. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 44: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Sesuit Harbor, Mass. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 45: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of New Creek, Staten Island, N. Y. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 46: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Main Channel, leading from Turkey Point to Havre de Grace, Harford County, Md. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 47: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Severn River, with particular reference to Ringgold Cove, Anne Arundel County, Md. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 48: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Apes Hole Creek, Somerset County, Md. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 49: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Chincoteague Bay, with a view to establishing a harbor of refuge at Chincoteague, Accomack County, Va. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 50: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Middle Creek, N. C. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 51: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.; small-boat channel at Bay Bridge. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 52: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Pensacola Bay, Fla., channel at Bayou Texar. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 53: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey to determine the feasibility of providing a permanent channel from the Gulf of Mexico into Fort Myers Beach, Estero Island, Fla. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 54: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of channels in Lake Minnetonka, Minn. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 55: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Seabeck Harbor, Hood Canal, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 56: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Eagle Harbor, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 57: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Port Townsend, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 58: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of coasts of the Hawaiian Islands with a view to the establishment of harbors for light draft vessels for refuge and other purposes. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 59: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 60: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 61: Provides for changing the citation of the River and Harbor Act of 1949 to the River and Harbor Act of 1950. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 62: Provides for changing the word "title" to "Act". House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 63: Provides for changing the word "title" to "Act". House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 64, Connecticut River basin: This amendment modifies the existing project for Hartford, Conn., in the Connecticut River Basin to provide for the Folly Brook dike and conduit consisting of 1,900 linear feet of pressure conduit and 700 feet of earth dike at an estimated cost to the United States of \$239,000, and at an estimated cost to local interests of \$150,000 to

cover the provisions of local cooperation applicable to the previously authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment identifying the project by a description of the length of the dike and conduit and by inserting the estimated cost of local cooperation. This change was made to further identify the modification of the existing project and to make clear that the usual conditions of local cooperation are applicable.

Amendment No. 65, Susquehanna River Basin: This amendment modifies an existing project authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1936, which provides for local protection works on Chemung River at Corning, N. Y. The recommended modification provides for the improvement of Monkey Run Creek at Corning, N. Y., by the construction of an open flume and conduit between the existing works on Monkey Run Creek above Sixth Street and the Chemung River at Pine Street, together with auxiliary works consisting of storm sewer outlets and a pumping plant. The estimated cost to the United States for construction is \$2,370,000. Local interests must furnish the usual requirements of local cooperation and also contribute \$250,000 in cash or in an equivalent amount of construction or reconstruction work, and must also restore city streets and pavements over the flume and conduit and provide adequate pumping capacity for disposal of storm waters draining through the property of the Corning Glass Works and not intercepted by the project. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 66, Pasquotank River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project providing for the construction of a dike and other appurtenant structures for flood control and related purposes in the vicinity of the Pasquotank River at an estimated cost to the United States of \$109,900, subject to the provisions of local cooperation specified by present law with respect to local protection projects. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 67, Savannah River Basin: This amendment would increase the authorization for the construction of the Hartwell project in the Savannah River Basin from \$40,000,000 to \$63,377,000. House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment reducing the amount of \$63,377,000 to \$50,000,000. The conferees considered that the reduced amount would be sufficient authorization for a 3-year period.

Amendment No. 68, central and southern Florida: This amendment would increase the additional authorization for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida approved in the act of June 30, 1943, from \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 69, Orleans Parish levees: This amendment modifies the improvements contemplated by the Flood Control Act of May 15, 1928, by extending the scope to include such improvements in the parish of Orleans, La., and to permit retention of jurisdiction by the Board of Levee Commissioners of the Orleans Levee District, State of Louisiana, over the completed improvements covered by this amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to include these levees in the Federal project for the control of floods in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River in the same manner as for other communities on the main stem of the Mississippi River in its alluvial valley. In this connection, for the purpose of clarification, the conferees considered and concluded that the project for Lake Pontchartrain, La., page 27, lines 1 through 20 of the bill which was not in conference is now adequately covered in and prescribed by Senate Document No. 139, Eighty-first Congress, which it is the

intent to authorize. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 70, Grants Canal, La.: The purpose of this amendment is to permit the Federal Government to fill a stagnant ditch which was dredged during the War Between the States and which has been partly filled by local interests. The conferees feel that the filling of the remainder of the ditch by the Federal Government to avoid the present health menace to the community is properly an item of Federal expense. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 71, Des Arc, Ark.: This amendment adopts a new project for flood protection at Des Arc, Ark., to alleviate present dangerous flood conditions in this area. The project would provide for construction of an earth levee, drainage facilities, pumping plants, diversion ditches, and sewer modifications. The total length would be about 1½ miles. The estimated cost to the United States is \$228,000, and local interests are required to assume the customary requirements of local cooperation required by existing law in connection with flood-control projects. The project is particularly necessary in view of the fact that completion of levees on the east bank of the White River presently authorized will increase the severity of floods in Des Arc. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 72, bank erosion on Amite River, La.: This amendment adopts an emergency bank protection project to prevent serious bank caving which has caused damage to Amite Cemetery, Livingston Parish, La., and which will continue to destroy graves unless checked. The project, which is estimated to cost \$50,000, provides for the construction of a cut-off channel and a pile deflection dike. The conferees consider that the necessary corrective measures proposed by this amendment should be undertaken. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 73, Arkansas River Basin, Optima Reservoir: This amendment provides that the conservation storage for irrigation now authorized by existing law to be maintained in the Canton Reservoir shall be achieved by coordinated design, construction, and operation of the three reservoir system comprising the Optima Reservoir, the Fort Supply Reservoir, and the Canton Reservoir. The amendment would result in an eventual reduction of flood control storage when silt encroachment in the reservoirs infringed on the total live storage capacity. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment to maintain the integrity of the flood control storage provided at the expense of the Federal Government and to permit the conservation storage in the Canton Reservoir as authorized by existing law to be maintained insofar as practicable until such time as silt deposits threaten to encroach upon the capacity for flood control.

Amendment No. 74, Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River and tributaries: This amendment modifies the general comprehensive plan for the Arkansas River Basin approved by the act of June 28, 1938, as amended, and by the River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946, by substitution of Keystone Reservoir on the Arkansas River for the Mannford Reservoir on the Cimarron River and by the deletion of the Blackburn and Taft Reservoirs on the Arkansas River. The estimated cost of the Keystone Reservoir is \$89,500,000. The estimated cost of the Mannford, Blackburn, and Taft Reservoirs, as approved, was \$52,227,000. Although the difference in these costs is \$37,273,000, there will be an actual saving in excess of \$24,000,000 by the substitution of the one reservoir for the three because of the increase in costs since the three reservoirs were authorized. The project will also provide essentially complete protection

from floods on the Arkansas River from the Keystone site to the mouth of the Verdigris River and a much higher degree of protection downstream from that point than would be provided by the Mannford Reservoir and will permit a more flexible operation of the reservoir system with increased benefits and will effect savings in the costs of certain local protection projects. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 75, Oklahoma City, Okla.: This amendment provides for modification of the existing project which consists of levees along both banks of the North Canadian River by substitution of an improved channel through Oklahoma City. The estimated cost to the United States is \$10,460,000 and to local interests \$6,040,000. The conferees feel that the modification would result in a materially better project due to changed conditions. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 76, Arkansas River, Pueblo, Colo.: This amendment adopts a new project for a levee along the Arkansas River in the vicinity of Pueblo at an estimated cost to the United States of \$209,000, subject to the customary provisions of local cooperation required by existing law for local protection projects with special conditions applying to this project. The conferees note that local interests have expended about \$5,000,000 for flood protection works at Pueblo and consider the improvement well justified because of the protection afforded to this important railroad, industrial, and distribution center. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 77, Grand Prairie Region and Bayou Meto Basin, Ark.: This amendment inserts the proper document number left blank in the House bill. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 78, Illinois River at Beardstown, Ill.: This amendment adopts a new project providing for construction of a new section of flood wall to replace that lost and damaged and for raising, strengthening, and extending the remaining portion of the flood wall and levees, all located at Beardstown, Ill., on the south bank of the Illinois River, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$2,976,000, subject to the usual provisions of local cooperation required by existing law in connection with flood protection projects. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 79, Ohio River Basin: This amendment increases the monetary authorization for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan for the Ohio River Basin from \$75,000,000 to \$100,000,000 to provide a sufficient monetary ceiling to permit the completion of projects under way and to permit the prosecution of the comprehensive plan. Initiation of work on new projects can be accomplished within the \$100,000,000 additional authorization by the excess of this authorization over the deficit in connection with the cost of projects completed or under way. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 80, Mining City Dam and Reservoir, Ky.: This amendment insures that the Mining City Dam and Reservoir in Kentucky or its alternates will not be constructed if such construction would have an adverse effect on Mammoth Cave National Park. The conferees understand that construction under existing authorization would be undertaken in such manner as to have no adverse effect upon the Mammoth Cave National Park. It is the understanding of the conferees that the purpose of the amendment is to emphasize the necessity of preserving this national park. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 81, Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.: This amendment adopts a new project providing for the protection of the towns of Cumberland and Barbourville, Ky., by channel improvements and a system of levees, subject to the customary provisions of local cooperation required by ex-

isting law in connection with flood protection improvements. The estimated cost to the United States for the Cumberland improvement is \$67,000, and for the Barbourville improvement, \$1,765,000. The conferees feel that improvements at these localities are feasible and justified. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 82, Red River of the North Basin: This amendment increases the amount adopted by the House from \$4,000,000 to \$8,000,000 which will be sufficient to complete the authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment and agree to the same with an amendment identifying the printed report for this project.

Amendment No. 83, Rio Grande Basin: This amendment increases the House amount by an additional \$5,000,000 which will be sufficient for completion of the Corps of Engineers' portion of the project. It also adds an authorization of \$30,179,000 for the work to be prosecuted by the Department of the Interior as provided for in the authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement and agree to the amendment with an amendment identifying the printed report for the project.

Amendment No. 84, Colorado River Basin: This amendment adopts a project for flood control consisting of the Pine Canyon and Matthews Canyon Reservoirs in the Meadow Valley Wash Basin at an estimated Federal cost of \$1,986,000. This project has a favorable benefit to cost ratio of 1.32. The House conferees recede from their disagreement and agree to the amendment with an amendment identifying the report printed in House Document No. 530, Eighty-first Congress.

Amendment No. 85, Gila River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project for a flood-control basin, Painted Rock Reservoir on the Gila River, 126 river miles above Yuma, at an estimated cost to the United States of \$25,800,000, subject to the conditions that local interests must adjust all water-right claims and keep the flood channel of the Gila River downstream from the dam free from encumbrances. The conferees understand that the improvement is needed not only to prevent flood damage in the lower Gila River and lower Colorado River areas, but also in the Imperial Valley in California. The project according to representatives of the State Department and the International Boundary Commission is an integral part of the plan contemplated in the Mexican water treaty of 1944. The House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 86, Humboldt River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project on the Humboldt River and its tributaries in Nevada providing for three storage reservoirs, supplementary channel improvements, and a system of drainage canals and appurtenant works in the lower basin. The total estimated cost to the United States is \$7,679,000. Local interests must furnish assurances that they will provide the customary requirements of local cooperation covered by existing flood-control laws in connection with local protection projects, and must furnish certain supplementary cooperation in connection with the drainage improvements and the reservoirs, including the contribution of \$2,762,000 in cash toward the reservoir construction costs. The improvement is also subject to the conditions that local interests agree on the method of operation of the reservoirs. The conferees note that the Department of Interior and the Corps of Engineers agree that authorization would be desirable and necessary to permit the solution of the problems involved in arriving at satisfactory arrangements between local interests and the Federal agencies. The conferees also understand that construction of the reservoirs will not proceed until satisfactory arrangements are worked out among the Federal, State, and

local agencies for repayment of a proper portion of the cost allocation for conservation storage. The conferees understand that the channel improvements in the lower portion of the basin recommended by the Corps of Engineers have been coordinated fully with the works proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and may be undertaken without affecting the other features of the plan. The conferees agree that the improvements are feasible and desirable and should be authorized at this time. The House conferees recede from their disagreement with the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment providing for clarification and identification of the project by reference to the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Amendment No. 87, Sacramento River Basin: This amendment provides for modification of the flood-control project for the protection of Butte Basin authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. The proposed plan which is in the nature of interim protection provides for a levee bypass through Butte Basin so designed and constructed as to fit into and become a part of the authorized project. The estimated cost to the United States is \$3,500,000 and local interests must provide the usual local cooperation required by existing law in connection with local protection projects. The conferees feel that construction of this improvement to provide interim protection is fully justified and necessary prior to the completion of the previously authorized project. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to this amendment and agree to the same with an amendment identifying the project by including a reference to the appropriate House document number.

Amendment No. 88, Russian River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project providing for the immediate authorization as an initial stage, channel stabilization works on the Russian River and Coyote Valley Reservoir on the east fork of the Russian River. This initial stage would be part of an ultimate development which would involve increasing the storage capacity of Coyote Valley Reservoir and the construction of an additional reservoir on Dry Creek. The estimated cost to the United States of the initial stage is \$11,552,000 and local interests would be required to contribute \$5,598,000 in cash toward the reservoir construction. The conferees note, as developed during the hearings on this project before the Senate Committee on Public Works, that local interests are prepared to pay in full their share of the costs of the project allocable for water conservation storage and that the Interior Department has agreed that as soon as this payment is made the funds would be transferred from the Interior Department to the Corps of Engineers which is charged with the construction work, and that the interests of the Interior Department in the administration of the project would then be turned over to local interests for their own operation and administration. The House conferees recede from their disagreement to the Senate amendment and agree to the same with an amendment providing for clarification and identification of the project by reference to the report of the Chief of Engineers.

Amendments Nos. 89 to 106, inclusive, Columbia River Basin, including Willamette River: These amendments modify and augment previous authorizations for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in the Willamette River Basin and in the Columbia River Basin by authorizing additional improvements consisting of dams, power facilities and appurtenant works, levees, overflow-channel closures, channel improvements, bank protection works, channel clearing and snagging, improvements for preservation of fish, local protection works, and navigation harbors, all as specifically itemized in these amendments.

The conferees have given careful consideration to the amendments and to the general question of additional authorizations for improvements for flood control, navigation, and related purposes in the Columbia River Basin. The conferees feel that the development of the Pacific Northwest for these purposes in accordance with the plans of the Chief of Engineers as contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, recently transmitted to the Congress, is urgent because of the necessity of providing protection from major and devastating floods and because of meeting as soon as practicable the ever-increasing demands for hydroelectric power in the rapidly expanding economy of the area. The conferees feel further that approval of units which will fit into the over-all development should be recognized at this time.

The conferees agree that the intent and purpose of amendments 89 to 106, inclusive, can best be accomplished by approving those projects in the Senate amendments which are in the comprehensive plan of development as contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress and have also been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and by authorizing for appropriation an amount which will be sufficient to start construction work on the most important units. The conferees note that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in his letter dated February 1, 1950, transmitted the President's views on the Columbia River Basin projects, and although approving the greater number of projects included in the Senate amendments and also in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, excluded some as being not in accord with the program of the President at this time. The conferees feel that the projects which should be approved and for which partial authorization should be granted should be limited at this time to those included in the Senate amendments and approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

In this connection, the conferees note that the House bill and the Senate amendments include all projects of the Corps of Engineers which had Budget approval except for a few in the Willamette River Basin involving the construction of dams at alternative sites in substitution for dams previously authorized in the comprehensive Willamette River Basin plan which are no longer feasible of construction because of changed conditions principally due to World War II and the general expansion of the population in the Willamette River Basin, which have taken place in the period subsequent to authorization. In connection with the alternative dams at the Cougar, Blue River, and Green Peter sites approved by the Bureau of the Budget, the conferees are of the opinion that the Corps of Engineers has authority to construct these projects under existing law as alternatives for the projects originally authorized.

In connection with the projects in the Willamette and Columbia River Basins as contained in the House bill, the conferees note that the identification reference is to the report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors dated February 21, 1949. These projects inserted by the House are a part of the comprehensive plan for the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, and are contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, which was not available at the time of passage of the House bill. Since these items were not the subject of conference, their proper identification by substituting House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, in lieu of the report of the Board of Engineers could not be accomplished, but the conferees desire to make clear that these projects are in the House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress. The partial authorization of \$75,000,000 proposed in the substitute amendment of the conferees represents

a reduction from a total of \$141,253,000, which was the total of the authorizations in the Columbia and Willamette Basins contained in the Senate amendments. With respect to the projects in the Senate amendments, the proposed amendment of the conferees would result in elimination of the project for modification of Fern Ridge Dam, Oreg., the reduction of the total sum for local flood protection works on the Columbia Basin from \$28,000,000 to \$15,000,000, the elimination of the project for Hepner Dam, Oreg., and the elimination of the item for harbors at various locations in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 89 to 106, inclusive, and agree to the same with an amendment which strikes out the language now contained in Senate amendments Nos. 89 through 106, inclusive, and substitutes in lieu thereof an amendment which approves the projects for flood control and other purposes in the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, substantially in accordance with the plans recommended in the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 28, 1949, and approved in the letter dated February 1, 1950, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for construction by the Corps of Engineers, both contained in House Document No. 531, Eighty-first Congress, these being the projects which are listed in the bill, and which authorizes to be appropriated the sum of \$75,000,000 for partial accomplishment of the listed projects and for continued prosecution of the previously approved plan for the Willamette Basin.

Amendment No. 107, Green-Duwamish River Basin: This amendment adopts a new project providing for a dam and reservoir in the Green River upstream from Seattle, Wash., for flood control. The estimated cost to the United States is \$16,300,000, and local interests are required to contribute \$2,000,000 to the cost of the project. The conferees feel that the project is needed to protect parts of the city of Seattle. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 108: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and their tributaries, and such other streams in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, where power development appears feasible and practicable, to determine the hydroelectric potentialities, in combination with other water and resource development. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 109: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Israel River, at and in the vicinity of Lancaster, N. H., in the interest of flood control and related purposes. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 110: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Nanticoke River and tributaries, Maryland and Delaware, in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 111: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Mattaponi River, Va. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 112: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Perquimans River, N. C. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 113: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Filberts Creek at Edenton, N. C. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 114: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of streams on Johns Island and vicinity, South Carolina, in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 115: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Combahee River, Broad River, Black River, and

their tributaries, all in the State of South Carolina. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 116: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Satilla River, Ga.; Saint Marys River, Ga. and Fla.; Suwannee River, Ga. and Fla.; for flood control, navigation, and other beneficial uses. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 117: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Streams in Saint Johns, Flagler, and Putnam Counties, Fla., for flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 118: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Manatee River, Fla. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 119: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of coastal streams flowing into the Gulf of Mexico between the Suwannee and Apalachicola Rivers, with a view to their improvement in the interest of flood control and related purposes. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 120: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Blackwater River, Fla. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 121: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Yellow River, Fla. and Ala. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 122: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Blackwater and Perdido Rivers, Ala. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 123: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Nine Mile Drain and Carlow Ditch, Macomb County, Mich. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 124: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Hatchie and Tusculum Rivers, Miss. and Tenn., in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 125: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey and study of alternate sites for the Millwood Reservoir, Ark., in the Red River Basin. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 126: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Dry Cimarron River, Union County, N. Mex., and Cimarron River, Okla., Colo., and Kans. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 127: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Salt River, Ky. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 128: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Lower Rio Grande Valley, including streams in Starr, Hidalgo, Cameron, and Willacy Counties, Tex., in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 129: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Buffalo Creek, Marion County, W. Va. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 130: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of waterway from Rangeline Lake to Oconto River, Wis., in the interest of flood control and major drainage improvements. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 131: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Milwaukee River and tributaries, Wisconsin. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 132: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Sacramento River, Calif., in the interest of bank protection and channel improvements below Red Bluff. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 133: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Walnut Creek drainage area, Contra Costa County, Calif. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 134: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Reclamation District No. 768, Humboldt County, Calif. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 135: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Mar-

tin Creek, at and in the vicinity of Paradise Valley, Humboldt County, Nev. House conferees concur.

Amendments Nos. 136 and 137: These amendments change the House provision authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Gleason Creek, Robinson Watershed, in the vicinity of White Pine County, Nev., by providing that the survey shall apply to the section at and in the vicinity of Ely, Nev. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 138: Item provides for preliminary examination and survey of Samish River, Wash. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 139 (sec. 206): Provides that the dam site known as West Peterborough Dam in the Merrimack River Basin, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and modified by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, shall hereafter be known and designated as the Edward MacDowell Dam, and any law, regulation document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name of West Peterborough Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of Edward MacDowell Dam. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 140 (sec. 207): Provides that funds hereafter appropriated for a specific and heretofore authorized project for a river, harbor, or flood-control works shall be merged with and be accounted for under the regular annual appropriation title applicable to such item. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 141 (sec. 208): Provides that section 204 of the Flood Control Act of 1948 is hereby amended by adding to the item therein for harbors and rivers in Alaska the following: "and that Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways in Alaska, for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and allied purposes shall be continued under the jurisdiction of and shall be prosecuted by the Department of the Army under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers." House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 142 (sec. 209): Provides that the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army are directed to review their previous studies and to report to the Congress the amount of the total cost of the Alamogordo Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River, N. Mex., which is properly allocable to flood control, in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved August 11, 1939. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 143: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 144: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 145: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 146: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 147: The effect of this amendment is to change the total amount authorized by the bill so as to conform to the action of the conferees. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 148: Provides that the sum of \$1,500,000 additional is authorized to be appropriated and expended by the Federal Power Commission for carrying out any examinations and surveys provided for in this act or any other acts of Congress, to be prosecuted by the Federal Power Commission. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 149: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 150: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 151 (sec. 216): Provides that section 7 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, as amended by section 15 of the act approved December 22, 1944, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized in his discretion to undertake such emergency measures for run-off retardation and soil-erosion prevention as may be needed to safeguard lives and property from floods and the products of erosion on any watershed whenever fire or any other natural element or force has caused a sudden impairment of that watershed: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$300,000 out of any funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the prosecution by the Secretary of Agriculture of works of improvement or measures for run-off and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on watersheds may be expended during any one fiscal year for such emergency measures."

House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 152: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 153: Provides for a change in section number. House conferees concur.

Amendment No. 154, Arkansas-White and Red River Basin Study Commission: The purpose of this amendment is to create a Commission to make studies and recommend a coordinated plan for conservation and development of the soil and water resources of the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins. It is the opinion of the conferees that such a study can be accomplished and the results coordinated with the appropriate Federal and State agencies under existing procedures of the Corps of Engineers as governed by law and administrative procedure. The conferees felt, therefore, that the purposes of amendment No. 154 can be adequately accomplished by adopting a substitute amendment and has inserted the substitute amendment in its proper place in the section of the bill dealing with such surveys. The purpose of the substitute amendment is to enable the Corps of Engineers to assemble all existing data and to perform such studies as necessary to prepare a comprehensive report for the basins included and to utilize the surveys and data available from other Federal agencies within their respective spheres of operations as defined by law, and in cooperation with State agencies.

Amendment No. 155, change in section number: This amendment provides for change in section number. House conferees recede from their disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment which provides for an additional change in section number necessitated by changes made by the conferees in prior sections.

Amendment No. 156, change of date: This provides for change in the date of title II from "1949" to "1950". House conferees concur.

WILL. M. WHITTINGTON,
HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
CLIFFORD DAVIS,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
HOMER D. ANGELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is unanimous. All amendments inserted by the Senate and agreed to by the House are described fully in the statement by the managers on the part of the House. All amendments adopted by the Senate and modified or amended by the conferees are described in detail in the conference report. Moreover the statement by the managers on the part of the House contains the name and the amount of the authorizations in the House bill together with a list of the items as agreed to in the conference for both rivers and harbors and flood control. There were reductions in most of the material in-

creases in the authorizations contained in the Senate amendments.

The statement by the Managers on the part of the House is very full, and contains the projects in the bill as it passed the House and the projects inserted by the Senate and approved by the conference with the estimated costs in both the river and harbor and flood control titles of the bill of all projects approved by the conference. All amendments inserted by the Senate are described in detail in the report.

The Senate devoted much time to the debate of the bill. Amendments were offered that would have materially increased the authorizations and would have changed existing laws with respect to reclamation projects in the Columbia River Basin, and after extensive debate the amendments were rejected by the Senate.

The Senate rejected substantially all amendments offered on the floor of the Senate after extensive debate. The bill as passed by the Senate, therefore, contains the amendments as reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, and the Senate rejected, as stated, other material amendments offered on the floor. The Senate committee opposed amendments offered on the floor that had not been considered by that committee. It will be observed, therefore, that the bill as passed by the Senate rejected amendments that would have materially increased the authorizations and really changed existing laws. The Senate is to be commended for the course adopted in the passage of the bill. The Senate amendments are largely confined to the adoption of amendments authorizing projects transmitted to Congress by the Chief of Engineers after the bill passed the House and were carefully considered by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

The river and harbor amendments of the Senate on the Arkansas and the Ouachita Rivers were reduced by \$24,650,000. The largest project approved by the conferees for rivers and harbors is the Monongahela River in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, at an estimated cost of \$29,000,000. This is a large project, but if Congress is to continue to promote navigation the project is thoroughly justified. If Congress is to discontinue river and harbor improvements, the project for the Monongahela River should be rejected.

The Senate amended the flood-control authorization for the Ohio River by increasing it \$25,000,000. The authorization in the House bill would only have provided for substantially completing the projects under way. The conferees believed the \$25,000,000 to be justified.

In the Columbia River Basin, including the Willamette River Basin, the report with the favorable recommendations of the Chief of Engineers as approved by the budget was transmitted to Congress after the House reported the bill. It involves flood control and river and harbor projects in the Pacific Northwest aggregating approximately \$1,500,000,000. The Senate properly approved the report of the Chief of Engineers and authorized about \$142,000,000 for the partial accomplishment of the projects.

The conference agreed to reduce this amount to \$75,000,000. I believe the economy will be promoted by approving the conference report. There are bills pending in both the House and Senate for the establishment of Columbia Valley Administration. Such an administration would supplant the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Columbia and Willamette River Basins. The adoption of the conference report contemplates that the river and harbor and flood-control projects in that basin shall continue to be planned and constructed by the Chief of Engineers, just as they are planned and constructed by the Chief of Engineers in all other river basins.

The pending bill is for authorizations. They are essential for general flood control after the appropriations are made as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations in the House, for the next fiscal year the remaining authorizations will be less than the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year for general flood control. If flood control is to continue, additional authorizations for general flood control must be made. The conference report contemplates authorizations for a period of 3 years. There have been no authorizations except for emergencies for flood control since 1946. If in the interest of economy it is necessary to reduce the annual appropriations that policy may be followed. On the other hand if widespread unemployment should obtain, the public interest would be promoted by having a shelf of approved projects that can be constructed not only for flood control, but at the same time to provide for unemployment. The conference report increases the authorizations for general flood control in the House bill by \$250,000,000, but this increase includes, among others, the increase in the basin authorization of \$25,000,000 along the Ohio River, and includes \$75,000,000 for the initiation of the projects along the Columbia and Willamette Rivers. The authorization for the Keystone Reservoir, while for \$37,000,000 more, will result in a saving of authorizations amounting to \$24,000,000, for this reservoir as agreed to by the conferees is to be substituted for three other reservoirs, the Mannford, the Blackburn, and the Taft Reservoirs along the Arkansas. In the State of Washington the Eagle Gorge Reservoir at an estimated cost of \$16,000,000 was included as a Senate amendment. It was transmitted in regular course and recommended by the Chief of Engineers. The report had not been transmitted to the House at the time the House bill was reported.

The Senate agreed to all of the projects in the House bill. On the other hand, the House approved the Senate amendments for projects where recommended by the Chief of Engineers in some cases with modifications, and reductions of the amounts authorized. The House conferees feel that the Senate conferees were most liberal in agreeing to take all House authorizations and in agreeing to modify in essential particulars so as to definitely show that the works in the Columbia River and Willamette River Basins as recommended

by the Chief of Engineers were approved, and that partial authorizations were made for their partial accomplishment as approved by the Director of the Budget.

I emphasize that the pending bill is the first comprehensive bill, including both river and harbor and flood-control authorizations agreed to by the conferees since 1946 except for emergencies in 1948, and I further emphasize that the total authorizations in the pending bill in the conference report are in reality smaller than the last general authorization for both rivers and harbors and flood control in 1946, 1945, and 1944.

While there were 156 amendments adopted by the Senate, the vast majority of these amendments embraced preliminary examinations and surveys for rivers and harbors and for flood control. Amendments 42 to 58, inclusive, embraced Senate amendments providing for 17 preliminary examinations and surveys for river-and-harbor projects.

Amendments 108 to 138, 31 in number, cover preliminary examinations and surveys for flood-control projects. The most important of these examinations covers the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and their tributaries and other streams in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. Provision was made for a comprehensive study of the Arkansas, White, and Red River Basins in the States of Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, and Louisiana.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR 3 YEARS

The authorizations in the bill as reported to the Senate amounted to \$1,564,814,825, and as passed by the Senate amounted to \$1,592,873,325, which includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, as against a total of \$1,117,586,175 as passed by the House. The total amount carried in the bill as agreed to in the conference is \$1,453,414,325, exclusive of \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, or there is a substantial reduction of the Senate amendments of \$109,280,000. The largest of these reductions are authorizations contained in Senate amendments for the Arkansas and Ouachita Rivers, for the Savannah River Basin, and for the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. The authorizations will provide for construction for substantially 3 years.

APPROPRIATIONS

The total appropriations for the current fiscal year for rivers and harbors and flood control aggregated substantially \$684,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1951 as reported by the House Committee on Appropriations, they aggregate \$301,000,000.

COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS

The House will recall that the pending bill is the first major combined river-and-harbor and flood-control bill that has been considered since the reorganization of the Congress. A rather modest authorization was passed primarily for emergency projects in 1948 and the authorizations in the act of 1948 aggregated for both rivers and harbors and

flood control \$87,619,000, including \$30,444,000 for rivers and harbors and \$57,175,000 for flood control.

In 1946 the aggregate amount was \$1,387,395,070 adjusted to today's cost index with the aggregate of the two bills amounting to \$1,760,000,000, which is approximately \$372,000,000 in excess of the authorization of the pending bill as agreed to by the conferees.

The total authorizations in the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the River and Harbor Act of 1945 amounting to \$1,341,968,332 adjusted to today's cost index amounted to \$2,080,000,000 or about \$639,000,000 in excess of the authorizations in the pending bill as agreed to in the conference.

THE RIVER AND HARBOR ACT OF 1950—THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Title I of the bill covers rivers and harbors, and as it passed the House it embraced 65 projects at an estimated cost of \$119,000,000. After the bill passed the House, additional reports with favorable recommendations by the Chief of Engineers were transmitted to Congress. The Senate approved the projects in the House bill and conducted hearings on the additional projects transmitted to Congress with favorable reports by the Chief of Engineers after the House bill was reported. By amendments, the Senate added 29 navigation projects recommended by the Chief of Engineers at an estimated cost of \$108,903,150. The conferees agreed to a reduction in the amounts authorized to be appropriated amounting to \$24,650,000, representing primarily reductions in authorizations for the Ouachita and Arkansas Rivers.

Title II of the bill covers flood control, and as it passed the House it carried authorizations for 22 new flood-control projects and for 18 modifications of authorized projects in the total amount of \$998,116,200. The Senate by amendments added 18 projects and modified or extended 6 projects in the total amount of \$366,384,000, which includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande. The new flood-control projects added by the Senate were based upon reports transmitted to Congress with favorable recommendations by the Chief of Engineers since the House bill was reported. They were not considered by the House because they had not been transmitted to Congress.

The managers on the part of the House carefully considered all Senate amendments, and they agreed to the Senate amendments with reductions in the amounts authorized for flood control amounting to \$84,630,000, which are reductions in the Savannah River Basin and in the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. There were other reductions, but these are the principal reductions. The comprehensive report on the Columbia River Basin had not been transmitted to Congress when the House reported the bill. It was transmitted to Congress before the bill was passed by the Senate. The bill approves the report of the Chief of Engineers as modified by the Director of the Budget but reduced the authorizations carried in the Senate bill for the initial

and partial construction of the projects to \$75,000,000 instead of \$142,000,000 as carried by the Senate amendments.

The Corps of Engineers has planned and executed river and harbor projects for the past 125 years. Many projects previously authorized are outmoded and will never be constructed. However, the total estimated costs of the balance of all river and harbor authorizations available up to the 25th of April 1950 were approximately \$2,051,616,000, or for authorizations for projects not under partial construction the difference between the said sum of \$2,051,616,000 and \$1,560,000,000, while on the other hand the total balance of authorizations available for general and Mississippi River flood control aggregates only about \$647,000,000. Additional authorizations especially for flood control are imperative. The conferees in making additional authorizations for rivers and harbors kept the balance of authorizations in mind, and for that reason the pending bill provides for vastly larger amounts of authorizations for flood-control projects than is provided for river and harbor projects.

The need at present is primarily additional authorizations for flood control to protect lives and property and to provide for the generation of much needed power especially in the Pacific northwest. The authorizations, therefore, for flood control as agreed to by the conferees are substantially six times as much as the authorizations for rivers and harbors. The managers on the part of the House believe that the bill as agreed to in conference will result in the passage by Congress of the most constructive river and harbor act and the most constructive flood-control act ever passed by the Congress.

The improvement of our national resources adds to the national wealth. Flood control and river and harbor improvements are valuable national assets. When Congress authorizes and appropriates for the improvement of our rivers and for the protection of our valleys, we are building America.

I cannot close without saying to the House that I have been a member of the Committee on Flood Control and of other important committees during the years, but I have never been a member of a committee whose membership was more industrious and faithful in attendance upon all hearings, and whose membership studied and considered more carefully all proposals submitted to them than the House Committee on Public Works.

I would like to make my acknowledgments to the former chairman of the committee and the present ranking minority member of that committee, my valued friend, GEORGE DONDERO. He has been indefatigable in his investigation of all proposals submitted to the committee, and his mature views have been most helpful. He has promoted through the years the national rather than the partisan view respecting the improvements of the national resources of the Nation. There is no more capable or faithful Member of the House of Representatives than my friend the gentleman

from Michigan, **GEORGE DONDERO**. He is a patriotic citizen and a most able Representative. I will always treasure my associations with all the members of the Committee on Public Works.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [**Mr. McCORMACK**], who desires to ask me a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has answered my question about the New England survey about which I was going to inquire, which I appreciate very much.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I trust this report which in my judgment materially improves the bill as amended by the Senate will be approved by the House as the original bill was by a vote of 202 to 1, on August 22, 1949.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows of the terrible floods that are now raging in the Missouri Valley, and have been for the past couple of weeks, and the great problem that we have with floodwaters in the Missouri Valley.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am aware of the problem and the floods mentioned.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman feel that the Missouri Valley has been treated properly in the way of flood-control authorization in this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do. One of the largest authorizations is for the Missouri River Basin. That was approved by the House without dissent. It was also approved by the Senate and it was agreed to in the conference.

I now yield to my colleague, the ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [**Mr. DONDERO**], 7 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the kind and generous remarks made by our very able and distinguished chairman in regard to myself. My only hope is that I deserve what he said about me.

This House does not contain a Member who works harder, is a more thorough legislator, and a more brilliant Member of this body than our very able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [**Mr. WHITTINGTON**]. It is with keen personal regret that the news has come to me that he has chosen to withdraw voluntarily from the Congress of the United States. His district, his State, and our Nation will lose one of the ablest men in this body. I personally regret that he is leaving. I am sure he has the best wishes of all of us.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi [**Mr. WHITTINGTON**] about the gentleman who now has the floor. The gentleman from Mississippi [**Mr. WHITTINGTON**] never says anything unless he firmly believes it.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very large river and harbor and flood-control bill. For more than 17 years I have served on that committee, and have never come to this floor in opposition to a river and harbor or flood-control bill.

We passed the last bill in 1948, in the Eightieth Congress. When this bill went to the Senate some additions were made to it. If this bill did not cover an intended 3-year period, which makes 5 years in all, I think I would vote against it because of the amount. But when we divide the amount contained in this bill over a 3-year period it is not so large and is not out of line with previous legislation passed by this body for rivers and harbors and flood-control work. It is true the bill carries with it nearly a billion five hundred million in authorization, but I want to point out that when the bill passed the House last year \$785,000,000 of it was for increased authorization on projects already under construction, and some of them nearing completion. The total bill was \$1,100,000,000. That was necessary because of the increase in the cost of constructing this kind of work in the United States. When that amount is deducted, even with the additions made by the Senate, this bill is not out of line with other legislation which this Congress has passed for river and harbor and flood-control work of the Nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I have noticed in the tables that have been presented by the engineers very large increases resulting from changes in plans and increased plans for certain projects. Frankly, that has disturbed me. When bills have come before the Appropriations Committee for the purpose of providing funds to continue projects the result has been that the sponsors would come in to get their initial appropriation of a small amount and then come back for a large amount the next year. It has been very disturbing to those of us who have tried to keep things at all within bounds.

Mr. DONDERO. I realize the force of what the gentleman says. I, too, have had my differences with the Army Engineers on the question of increasing authorizations; but I recognize, and I think everybody else does, that within the last few years the costs of all construction work have increased very materially.

Mr. TABER. But these estimates have gone up way beyond what increases in cost would justify, and have been the result of large additions to the projects which were not disclosed to the Congress at the time the initial appropriations were made. That policy should not be continued.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. While I appreciate the force of the statement, the fact remains that practically all, and certainly all of the major works, are let on competitive bids. Regardless of the amount authorized or appropriated, the country gets the benefit of those competitive bids in the amount of the award.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The bill as it comes back to us lists many projects not contained in the bill at the time I left the House. Does the gentleman feel that at this particular time we should add over \$400,000,000 to the bill, which is the effect of the increases?

Mr. DONDERO. I think I know what the gentleman alludes to. I would not have included them if I had my say about it, or if it were left to my decision. They were included in the other body. They are mostly in the Pacific Northwest. No doubt that region, because of its rapid increase in population, needs more river and harbor flood-control work, and power dams. However, the conferees of the House did obtain a substantial reduction of \$85,000,000 in the flood-control amount included in the bill by the Senate. No items were deducted from the House bill; they were deducted from the Senate projects.

Mr. RICH. Does the bill now carry new projects in addition to what were contained in the bill at the time it passed the House?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; it includes the larger amount that was put in by the Senate for projects in the northwestern part of the United States.

Mr. RICH. Is the other body figuring on building these great power projects with the idea of socializing the Northwest? The Southwest?

Mr. DONDERO. This House and the committee know my stand on that question. I do not object to the Federal Government's producing the power; what I do object to is the Federal Government's going into the retail business of power and thereby coming into competition with private enterprise.

Mr. RICH. They not only furnish the power on a lot of these projects, but they build transmission lines that compete with private enterprise. The trouble is that eventually they will want to take over distribution to the consumer, socializing our country.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman. I have always opposed that policy.

Mr. RICH. We ought to oppose it. We do not want anybody to get the idea that we are for socialization. The Congress is supporting Great Britain now, a Socialist country. We want to stop this socialization and aid to socialism.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, regretfully, I must decline to yield further; there are other matters to which I wish to address myself.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction.

Mr. DONDERO. Certainly.

Mr. LARCADE. If the gentleman will refer to the tabulation he will find that the House conferees were responsible for reducing the Senate projects by \$109,280,000, rather than \$85,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. I had reference to the flood-control section. You are correct; the total reduction in the bill is \$109,280,000.

One thing more to which I wish to call attention: I asked the Army engineers

to make a tabulation of all the authorized projects now on the shelf. The total they gave me is \$2,160,000,000. When this amount is added to this bill we will have about three and one-half billion dollars. Since that amount is spread over an average period of 5 years you can see it is not far out of line with the amount we are appropriating each year for the continuation and construction of this work. We are now appropriating approximately \$600,000,000 annually for this work.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The fact of the matter is that many of the projects have been adopted years and years ago, many of them will not be constructed because they are outmoded at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman inform us in dollars how much was added to the bill by the Senate?

Mr. DONDERO. The amount in dollars added by the Senate for river and harbor work was \$108,903,000, and the amount added in the Senate for flood-control work was \$366,384,000.

Mr. KEATING. So that almost one-half billion of the billion and a half involved in the bill has been added by the Senate?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. When we had the bill here before it was approximately one billion?

Mr. DONDERO. That is right. The other body put in projects that were not ready for report to the House committee at the time the bill was before the House last year. They were reported to the Senate this year.

Mr. KEATING. I feel sure the gentleman shares my view, knowing his general feeling, that there are times such as the present when we might have to curtail on projects, that we might put them through at a different time and in a different state of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. The remedy for that is to withhold appropriations.

Mr. KEATING. The pressure is greater for them once they have been approved.

Mr. DONDERO. I have learned something about pressure in the years I have been here.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to correct a statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. The Federal Government does not engage in the retail sale of electricity. Where this power is owned by the Federal Government it does build transmission lines and sells at wholesale. It does not retail the power.

Mr. DONDERO. I am willing to debate that question with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to ask the gentleman one question. In connection with these items placed in the bill in the Senate were there budget estimates for those items?

Mr. DONDERO. I understand there were budget estimates, and we were so informed in conference.

Mr. RABAUT. None were put in on the floor over there?

Mr. DONDERO. That is my understanding. Perhaps the chairman can explain that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman has made a correct statement. If I may be permitted to say in response to the question, the bill as agreed to in conference accomplishes the very thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is undertaking to bring to our attention. We only approved works to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers in the Pacific Northwest just as they have been constructed everywhere else. We are not departing from that and permitting any other agency to construct them. There are no authorizations for transmission lines.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to ask this further question: Are the projects that have been placed in this bill in the Senate there with a budget estimate?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They are substantially with budget approval just as projects in the House bill were generally with budget approval.

Mr. RABAUT. Why does the gentleman say "substantially?"

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I use the word as the equivalent of immaterial, minor, or small. That is what I mean. In some cases, Congress does not agree with the Director of the Budget. But the big projects like the Columbia River Basin are in here with the approval of the budget and it is specifically stated in the conference report that in approving that project we approve it as recommended by the Chief of Engineers and upon the approval of the Director of the Budget.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that some of these things that are immaterial in the Senate appear quite gigantic in the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We understand that, and for that reason we are asking for partial authorization. And, I will say further that one of the largest items included in this conference report was recommended since the bill passed the House, and that is the \$29,000,000 for navigation along the Monongahela River, on which river there is more navigation today than any other river of its size in the world.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me to make that statement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As the gentleman has stated, the Senate increased the amount about \$500,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. FORD. The House was the saving influence, so to speak. Would anything be gained by returning this conference report to conference in an effort to cut the added amounts put on by the other body?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think so.

Mr. FORD. In other words, the gentleman feels that they would not recede if we should return the conference report.

Mr. DONDERO. No. We struggled with this matter for 2 days before we came to an agreement.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that the items put in by the other body and agreed to by the conferees in most instances take care of projects where there were worn-out locks, worn-out dams, and also construction partially completed?

Mr. DONDERO. Only some of the projects.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And failure to support in the main what was put in by the other body would result in loss rather than a saving over a long period.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the joys and pleasures of my 22 years of service in this body has been, and is today, by association with the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, WILL WHITTINGTON. We are all sorry to hear that our distinguished friend and colleague is not going to seek reelection. We know the confidence that the people of his district have in him, and that if he sought reelection, that he would be renominated and reelected without opposition.

When I first came here 22 years ago one of the first Members that I met was the gentleman from Mississippi, WILL WHITTINGTON. During my 22 years as a Member of this body a very close friendship has developed. I know of no Member during my period of service that has had more potent influence in the House than WILL WHITTINGTON; a man of unusual ability, a man of devotion to service, a man of loyalty to those great fundamental truths that he believes in. He has left his imprint in the Halls of Congress.

Today we are considering the final stage of the rivers and harbors bill, which will be the last rivers and harbors bill that our distinguished friend will sponsor as a Member of the House of Representatives, a bill in which he adopts the role of leadership in its passage through the Congress of the United

States. Many rivers and harbors bills have passed under his leadership. The one we are now considering is a great tribute, as will be evidenced by the unanimity by which it will be adopted, and shows the confidence that the House has in WILL WHITTINGTON, and the respect that we have for him and for his leadership. As majority leader for about 8 years I want to in that capacity express the deep gratitude that I have for WILL WHITTINGTON in the ever loyal way in which he has supported my leadership. I know in that statement I express the sentiment of Speaker RAYBURN.

Speaking for all of our colleagues without regard to party, and I think I can do so without anyone taking issue, everyone who ever served with WILL WHITTINGTON has the highest respect for him and a complete feeling of confidence in him. If ever a man has impressed me with his intellectual honesty it has been WILL WHITTINGTON. His ability I have referred to, and his integrity is above reproach.

Above all, the trait in him that I have admired is his loyalty, his loyalty to his spiritual beliefs, his loyalty to his country, his loyalty to the House, his loyalty to his committee, his loyalty to his party, his loyalty to his leadership, his loyalty to his friends, and his loyalty to his constituents.

I regret very much that he is not coming back to the House because the country needs the services of a man like WILL WHITTINGTON at all times, but particularly in a period of stress and troubles such as we are undergoing today.

I take these few minutes to pay tribute to a great legislator, a great American, and a great man, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to report to the House the death of my constituent, a former illustrious Member of this House from 1906 to 1920, the Honorable J. Hampton Moore.

"Hammy," as he was so affectionately well known, had a long and honorable career in public service. He was one of the most active and energetic men it has been my privilege to know. His background was unusual; it spelled "activity" always. He was a reporter on the old Public Ledger in Philadelphia—probably his greatest story having been a report on the Johnstown flood; he was a court reporter, chief clerk to the city treasurer, secretary to a mayor, city treasurer, first Chief Clerk of the Bureau of Manufactures of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and president of a Philadelphia trust company. He will also be remembered for his long service as president of the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association.

Mr. Moore will be remembered by many of our colleagues as an active member of the Ways and Means Committee and an outstanding leader in the councils of the Republican Party when

that party was in control of Congress and the national administration. He left Congress to serve as mayor of Philadelphia, in which capacity he served two terms with great distinction.

Philadelphia and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen, a patriotic American, and a noted public servant. We mourn his passing; he will never be forgotten.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the appropriation bill is pending, as the Members realize, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this rivers, harbors, and flood-control bill at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak in behalf of the Green-Duwamish River flood-control project, which is situated in my congressional district. The Green River rises in the Cascades at an elevation of approximately 5,000 feet and flows in a northwesterly direction for about 60 or 70 miles, where it empties into the Puget Sound at Seattle, Wash. The flood plain begins just above the city of Auburn, which has a population of approximately 6,000. The river flows through a fertile valley, which is about 2 or 3 miles in width. The river joins with the Black River, and from the junction to the sound, about 12 miles away, the river is known then as the Duwamish River. The property on the lower Duwamish is prospective industrial-site property for the city of Seattle.

The two most recent and disastrous floods occurred in 1933 and 1946 inundating approximately 13,000 acres and 12,000 acres, respectively. The estimated damages from the 1933 and 1946 floods are estimated at about \$1,750,000 and \$1,350,000, respectively, on the basis of 1947 prices. These damages include both damage to valuable agricultural and to urban areas, floodwaters actually coming into the city of Kent. Just recently we had another flood which, although not as severe as the other two, did considerable damage. There is always the danger of another.

This proposed project has been carefully surveyed and approved by the district and division engineers of the United States Army, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and the Chief of Engineers. It also has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. The total estimated cost of the dam is \$18,300,000, of which \$2,000,000 will be contributed by the State and local governments. The 1949 Legislature of the State of Washington has appropriated \$1,500,000, to be made available when the project is authorized by Congress and funds appropriated. The Board of King County Commissioners has set aside \$500,000, to be made available as soon as the project is authorized. I am in receipt of a telegram from the board of county commissioners, which reads as follows:

County and State are ready financially to proceed with Eagle Gorge Dam work. Urgent

need that this project receive all possible attention.

Without question, Mr. Speaker, the dam is urgently needed.

The estimated benefits are \$893,000 annually and include abatement of floods, pollution control, and benefit to fish life. More particularly, this item is broken down in the following manner: \$429,000 from benefits of tangible flood damage; \$214,000 from increased return from protected agricultural lands; \$191,000 from increased returns from industrial lands; \$59,000 from benefit to fish life.

The annual carrying charge is estimated at \$823,139. With \$2,000,000 of the cost being borne by the State and county, the total carrying charges would be \$831,628, due to the interest rate of 3.5 percent applied to non-Federal cost. Maintenance and operation are estimated at \$80,000 annually.

I urge favorable action upon this project, which is of tremendous concern and importance to the people in the area affected.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the members of the conference committee, both on the House and Senate side, for their agreement on the full \$3,000,000 authorization for the completion of the plan approved in the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, for the Red River of the North Basin.

We have recently had a tremendous amount of flood damage both in Minnesota and North Dakota in the Red River of the North drainage basin and it is now more necessary than ever to expedite the surveys and develop the various projects which are included in the comprehensive plan so that these damaging floods will not recur each spring.

I certainly will support this conference report as I believe projects of this kind benefit the people of the area and in the long run return dividends to the United States Treasury.

I am of course happy that the bill includes my own suggested legislation calling for an examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes, including final and major drainage improvements under the direction of the Corps of Engineers for the following streams in northwestern Minnesota: Mud River, Thief River, Moose River, Lost River, Snake River, Tamarac River, Two River, Big Joe River, and Little Joe River, tributaries of the Red River of the North.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of year when the columnist and commentator declare open season on the omnibus river and harbor and flood-control bill by declaring it a pork-barrel measure. The inference is that most of the projects in the bill are there not because they do anyone any good except the Congress.

Not all and, I believe, very few of the projects in the bill are what can be called pork.

Let us examine a project in my own district as to whether it is a pork barrel or a worthy, needed undertaking.

The project to which I refer calls for the expenditure of \$16,000,000 to provide flood protection for the lower side of the Columbia River and to protect

some 8 miles of river bank from being eroded.

Now, \$16,000,000 is, I suspect, a large sum of money. However, the floods in this area of 2 years ago cost property damage estimated by the Army engineers at \$104,000,000 and 50 lives. The \$16,000,000 that this bill carried for flood-protection measures in this area will prevent the possibility of a repetition of this disaster.

If we do not build these \$16,000,000 of dikes, we may save that money, but, if a flood comes, we may suffer the loss of another \$104,000,000 of property. The spending of \$16,000,000 on these dikes, it seems to me, is good insurance and in the long run is less expensive than taking the chance of suffering the danger and damage of another great flood.

In short, we will pay for these dikes whether we build them or not. If we build them, we will be spending \$16,000,000, but if we do not build them, we may lose \$104,000,000 as the result of flood damage.

The total amount carried as estimates on the cost of projects in this bill are approximately \$1,600,000,000. Many will think Congress is spending that much money on river and harbor projects at this one time.

That is not the case. The projects authorized in this bill will not be constructed in any one year. Their construction will extend over several years or many years.

This is not an appropriation bill. It does not appropriate funds for any project. It merely states in effect that the projects in this bill are, in the opinion of the committees and of Congress, worthy to be constructed at some future time.

The Appropriations Committee later will determine which of these projects shall be started and when, and how many years it will require to complete any project in this bill.

Some of these projects will be started next year, no doubt, these being of an emergency nature. Others of the projects in this bill may not be undertaken for years.

This bill merely places the projects in it on the advance planning board for use when the Government has the available funds to undertake their construction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the discussion which was had between me and the gentleman from Mississippi relative to building these transmission lines and getting into socialism I want the gentleman from Mississippi to know that I know he is one of the advocates of power and while I would like to see a lot of power and cheap power I want to see more power in the House of Representatives to stay away from socialism. If you will use your energy to keep this country out of socialism as much as you are to try to get power you will be doing this country a great service. I want to say to the gentleman from Mississippi that in the Southwest you are distributing power from these transmission lines through these cooperatives and these cooperatives are not paying any taxes to

the Government. If that is not socialism or the next thing to it, why, then I do not know anything about socialism. What we have to do is to stop it. I want you to help to stop it. That is what I want to impress on you right now. The Members of Congress should remember that we have about \$11,000,000,000 of work now in progress on rivers and harbors and \$13,000,000,000 worth of flood-control work approved by Congress. This bill has been approved by the Congress. You have the Army engineers trying to help this country getting these flood-control projects ready. They have \$20,000,000,000 worth of work on the drafting boards approved by the Army engineers. That is a total of \$44,000,000,000. You cannot do this work all at one time. It must be distributed over a period of years. Years, I say, many years. Nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Mississippi, or we go broke. Yes, bankrupt. Be wise and economize.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is just mistaken to the extent of about \$40,000,000,000, that is all.

Mr. RICH. Forty-four billion dollars, and forty-four billion dollars to me is a whale of a lot of money but to some people it does not seem to be too much. You must stop going in the red.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and at the same time wish to state that there is nothing about power transmission in this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Truman submitted to the Senate for its ratification, a treaty between the United States and Canada covering the uses of the waters of the Niagara River. To implement this treaty, Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN and I are today jointly introducing the Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950. The first objective of the treaty, and our joint proposal, is to maintain Niagara Falls as a majestic American scenic spectacle. For generations the Falls have been a symbol for the whole Nation of the lavishness with which God endowed our country. It is estimated that about 1,000,000 people visit Niagara Falls each year; that is tribute enough to how much the Falls mean to Americans.

For some years, however, the scenic grandeur of Niagara has been imperiled. Uncontrolled erosion and uneven pressure of the turbulent waters has seriously threatened the crestline of the Falls. The treaty submitted by the President yesterday was negotiated primarily to fix permanently the spectacular grandeur that is Niagara Falls. Provision is made in the treaty for restoration of the Falls where erosion has damaged the crestline, so that the slow transformation of the Falls into a mere cascade can be stopped. Specific arrangements are provided in the treaty for guaranteeing the minimum amount of water that will roar over the Falls, and for building works to remedy the damage that is being done to the Falls.

If the sole consequence of this treaty, and our implementing bill, was to preserve the Niagara as an historic Amer-

ican institution, they would certainly be worthwhile. But far more is involved. As a result of the division of the water resources, we will have a greater opportunity to expand prodigiously the electric energy available in New York and the States which surround it. So much power potential exists in the Niagara that it staggers the imagination. Generation of 1,330,000 kilowatts of electrical power will be made possible on the United States side alone. Every year, the Niagara—if properly redeveloped—can yield 7,900,000 kilowatt-hours of new electrical energy. In magnitude, the Niagara power development proposed here would rank second only to the Grand Coulee in power generation capacity, and would just about equal it in the energy produced.

Such a vast increase in available electrical energy will naturally be of great concern to many interested parties. The interests of these parties must be reconciled so that the greatest public benefit results. In the State of New York alone, there are 3,800,000 consumers of residential electric service, 667,000 commercial users, and 22,000 industrial clients. All of these—and their neighbors across the State lines—will be affected by how much power is generated, how it is distributed, by whom, and how much it costs. A review of the section-by-section analysis of the bill will indicate how we propose to protect the legitimate interest of the various governments involved—and above all, of the people to whom this great resource belongs.

It is unthinkable that a development of public resources of this size should be made for the primary benefit of any profit-making individuals or groups. Yet there is not, at the moment, any public body authorized to develop the project. As of now, the Federal Power Commission is the only public agency with authority to grant licenses to private individuals or groups.

The bill which I am introducing puts the whole development question squarely up to the government of the State of New York. If New York cannot come to an appropriate agreement with the Federal Government for public development of the Niagara, then the Federal Government will act. In fact, the bill goes a little further than that. It authorizes the Corps of Engineers to begin construction at the Falls, even before the State of New York acts. The State of New York may then signify its willingness to assume responsibility for its operation, with guaranties for the rights of others.

Public development of the power at Niagara will mean the accomplishment of a goal that has been a New York State tradition since the beginning of this century. Again and again, the State's leaders—Democrats and Republicans alike—have called for public development. Here are some typical expressions of opinion.

Charles Evans Hughes, Governor of New York, 1907-10:

It is well to consider the great value of the undeveloped water powers * * * under State control. They should be preserved and held for the benefit of all the people and should not be surrendered to private interests. It would be difficult to exaggerate the

advantages which may ultimately accrue from these great resources of power if the common right is duly safeguarded. (Annual message to the legislature, January 2, 1907.)

These great natural sources of power should not only be developed in a manner which the State alone can make possible, but should be held for the benefit of the people under conditions which will insure the protection of the common right and fair return for privileges granted. (Annual message to the legislature, January 6, 1909.)

Theodore Roosevelt, Governor of New York, 1899-1900:

You have in this section a most valuable asset in your natural water power. You have elected too many men in the past who have taken what belongs to the Nation. Coal and oil barons cannot compare to water-power barons. Do not let them get a monopoly on what belongs to this State. * * * Do not give up your water power for a promise of quick development. We are poor citizens if we allow the things worth most to get into the hands of a few. (Address at Watertown, N. Y., October 10, 1914.)

Alfred E. Smith, Governor of New York, 1919-20; 1923-28:

"The cost of energy developed from falling water is determined very largely by the cost of the capital employed in the development. A public corporation such as you propose, whose securities would be exempt from taxation under the Federal law and the State law, should produce, if properly set up, the required money substantially cheaper than a private corporation could obtain it."

The authority for this statement also made the following statement:

"I see no objection, but on the contrary, I can see some advantages, to the development of the great water powers on the St. Lawrence and in the gorge of the Niagara by a public corporation rather than by a private corporation, and to the ownership of all lands, water rights, flowage, dams, powerhouses, and structures by such a public corporation."

The author of the statement above is Owen D. Young, chairman of the board of directors of the General Electric Co. * * *

There is only one issue at stake and it is this: Shall the State of New York, through a corporation of its own creation develop these great water-power resources for the benefit of all the people of the State or shall it give a license for a long term of years to a private corporation to develop for their own purposes? * * *

Such a public corporation is just as capable of carrying on the developments as a private one. It can hire the same brains and engineering ability that a private corporation can hire. It can float its securities against the earning power of the development a great deal cheaper than the private company can. Nothing stands in its way but the desire of a small group of men, powerful and influential, to retain for themselves and the private interests that they represent, the right to own and control these great water-power resources. * * * (The) legislature should adhere to a policy long ago suggested and once adopted, to develop these water powers by the State itself for the benefit of all the people as against private development for the benefit of the few. (Public statement, Albany, February 27, 1926.)

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Governor of New York, 1929-32:

In the brief time that I have been speaking to you, there has run to waste on their paths toward the sea, enough power from our rivers to have turned the wheels of a thousand factories, to have lit a million farmers' homes—power which nature has supplied us through the gift of God. It is intolerable that the utilization of this stupendous heritage should be longer delayed by petty squabbles and partisan dispute. Time will not

solve the problem; it will be more difficult as time goes on to reach a fair conclusion. It must be solved now.

I should like to state clearly the outstanding features of the problem itself. First, it is agreed, I think, that the waterpower of the State should belong to all the people. There was, perhaps, some excuse for careless legislative gift of power sites in the days when it was of no seemingly great importance. There can be no such excuse now. The title to this power must vest forever in the people of this State. No commission, no, not the legislature itself has any right to give, for any consideration whatever, a single potential kilowatt in virtual perpetuity to any person or corporation whatsoever. The legislature in this matter is but the trustee of the people, and it is their solemn duty to administer such heritage so as most greatly to benefit the whole people. On this point there can be no dispute. (Inaugural address, Albany, January 1, 1929.)

HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Governor of New York, 1933-42:

And this brings me to speak of another great power resource the State possesses in the falls of the Niagara River. There the potentialities are comparable to those of the St. Lawrence. I hope to see a public development of the latent power resources of Niagara so that the people of the State, whether in New York City, Buffalo, Binghamton, Albany, or on the farms, may participate in its benefits as well as those of the St. Lawrence.

Both of these great water powers belong to the people of the State and must be protected. I have on two former occasions recommended a constitutional amendment, designed to write into the State constitution the safeguard that the water-power resources owned by the State shall forever remain inalienable for the use of the people and not of private utility companies. I again recommend the adoption of this amendment to the constitution. (Special message to the legislature, January 14, 1941.)

Thomas E. Dewey, Governor of New York since 1943:

I have always strongly advocated the development of the power resources of the State by government, for the benefit of all the people and not for any private monopoly. (Public statement, Watertown, October 10, 1942.)

There are many, many more similar statements on the record. They leave no doubt about the long-standing almost universal commitment in New York State to public development. Public development will be practical as well as principled. With the credit of the people of New York State behind them, the interest charges on money for construction—a major factor in hydroelectric costs—will be practically cut in half. If the State of New York takes these works over—and I sincerely hope they do—they can finance the cost through private investment channels, and reimburse the Federal Government for any outlay. Should the State fail to exercise option we propose Congress to extend it; then it seems to me that Congress itself should set up an instrumentality to permit the Treasury to be reimbursed for the capital outlay by refinancing through private channels.

Right at the outset, I want to warn against the possible misrepresentations of this proposal by selfish, vested interests. We are not advocating nationalization of the electric power industry. Neither the Federal nor the State Gov-

ernments are in the business of retailing electricity. I am not advocating that they go into that business. What I am advocating is that the State or Federal Government be permitted to develop this great natural resource for the benefit of the people—all of them—to whom it belongs. The power produced can then be sold wholesale, with transmission to the load centers, to private companies, provided that preference goes to municipalities and nonprofit cooperatives. This is being done in many other parts of the country, and is completely consistent with our country's long-established power policy.

The enactment of this bill will be the first step in meeting a power deficiency in New York and the adjacent States. This deficiency caused grave concern during the war to our military and war-production leadership. Just a few days ago, continuing concern was expressed by the Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr., about this situation, before the House Committee on Public Works.

There is a great advantage—

Said the Secretary of the Army—

in having for national-defense purposes the large source of cheap, dependable power which would result if the project were completed. Specifically, it would be of material benefit in the production of strategically important aluminum.

He was testifying on the St. Lawrence River proposal, but his words obviously apply with equal force to the Niagara.

Just as this deficiency is inexcusable with respect to our national defense, it is inexcusable with respect to our economy. New York, and the region of which it is a part, have not kept pace with the expansion of power achieved by the rest of the country since 1920. Using 1900 as the base year (index 100), the Federal Power Commission reports that the national production of energy had gone to 717.4 by 1948. The New England States had gone to only 550.6; the Middle Atlantic States to only 585; New York lags in having reached an index rating of only 482.3.

Every responsible expert body has expressed complete confidence that the new energy created at the Niagara could be absorbed by the area in very short order. This has been generally true throughout the country. The late Senator George Norris is quoted as having said:

Wherever in this world an abundance of low-cost power has been developed, its very existence has immediately created a shortage.

The additional energy from Niagara would be absorbed by the farms, factories, and homes as a blotter absorbs ink. In 1948, New York was near the bottom of the list of States in the average amount of residential electricity used by its homes. The Empire State ranked forty-first in the list of States. It ranked forty-second in terms of the average cost of residential electricity; only six States had higher rates for home users. Public development of the Niagara would expand the power available, and would almost surely cut the costs to business, home, and farm users substantially.

It is impossible to forecast exactly what the rate reductions and average use expansions would be. But the Province of

Ontario right across the river offers some point of comparison, since there has been considerable public development of hydroelectric power. If we in New York had been paying the Ontario rates, we would have saved in 1948 alone, \$317,889,538. About \$112,000,000 of this saving would have gone to home users, about \$51,000,000 to industrial users, and about \$153,000,000 to commercial users.

Every home, business, farm, factory, and labor union has a dollars-and-cents interest in these figures and in the prospect of achieving savings like them. Expanded markets for consumer goods of many kinds would be created. The job of finally completing the electrification of our farms—more than 90 percent done—will be eased. Every day that we needlessly lose these great benefits, every day that we see them fall into the great gorge at the Niagara—damaging the falls in the process, must be a day of bitterness to those concerned with the fruitful use of our national abundance.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] such time as he desires.

(Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on the part of the House on this conference report, I want to express my approval of the statement made by the chairman of our committee, Mr. WHITTINGTON, and the ranking Republican member of the committee, Mr. DONDERO. First let me join with Mr. DONDERO in commending the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi, for the outstanding public service he has performed for the Nation down through the years as a Member of the House of Representatives. I join with my colleague, Mr. DONDERO, in stating that no Member of the House during my service here has been more diligent in his duties, more efficient in his work, and more considerate of the members of the committee over which he presides than has the gentleman from Mississippi. I am sure that every Member of the House has a deep feeling of regret that his service in the Congress will be terminated at the end of the Eighty-first Congress and that he is voluntarily retiring from public service. It will be a great loss to his district, to the State, and to the Nation.

The conferees of the House and Senate, as has been said, devoted much time to the consideration of the amendments to H. R. 5472 which were added in the Senate. After long conferences, the unanimous agreement was reached in which material savings in monetary authorizations were effected by reason of the insistence on the part of the House conferees that cuts in some of the authorizations be made. However, I feel certain that no great injury will be done to projects where the full amount was not allowed. My own projects in Oregon shared with other parts of the country in taking cuts in these authorizations. It should be remembered, of course, that this is an authorization bill and no part of the authorization in the bill can be expended until Congress by appropriations passes upon each individual proj-

ect. It should be said also that the conferees followed a uniform rule to withhold approval of any project that had not been approved by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, with one or two exceptions where special circumstances justified such approval. A major portion covers increases in existing appropriations or authorizations. It should also be pointed out that while this bill in the aggregate authorizes a large appropriation, nearly a billion and one-half dollars, it covers a long-range program extending for 3 years or more in the monetary appropriations allowed and also covers at least 2 years in the past for which authorizations have been provided. As a result, it covers 5 years in monetary authorizations, and the total amount allowed is not disproportionate to the annual appropriations that have been made in the past for the combined projects under rivers and harbors and flood control.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 5472, recommended:

Title I of the bill, rivers and harbors, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 65 projects in the amount of \$119,469,975. The Senate by amendments added 29 navigation projects costing \$108,903,150, making a grand total of \$228,373,125 for rivers and harbors. The navigation projects added by the Senate were based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. The conferees feel that they should now be included, since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

Title II of the bill, flood control, as it passed the House carried authorizations for 22 new flood-control projects

and for 18 modifications of authorized projects in a total amount of \$998,116,200. The Senate, by amendments, added 18 projects and modified or extended 6 projects contained in the House bill in a total amount of \$366,384,000, which includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on the Rio Grande, making a grand total of \$1,334,321,200 for flood control. The new flood-control projects added by the Senate were, as in title I, based on reports which were recommended by the Chief of Engineers, but were not submitted to Congress in time for consideration by the House committee, as shown by the Senate hearings, before the bill was reported to the House. As in connection with title I the conferees agree that these new projects should now be included since they have been submitted to Congress and heard and considered by the Senate committee.

The results of the conference are as follows:

For rivers and harbors the total additional amounts of \$108,903,150, as passed by the Senate, were reduced by agreement among the conferees by \$24,650,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Ouachita and Arkansas Rivers. The total additional amount for rivers and harbors, therefore, included by the Senate and agreed to in conference, is \$84,253,150.

With respect to flood control, the total additional amounts added by the Senate of \$366,384,000 of which \$30,179,000 is for work to be prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation were reduced by \$84,630,000, representing reductions in authorizations for the Savannah River Basin and the Columbia River Basin including the Willamette River Basin. The total additional amount, therefore, added by the Senate and agreed to in conference, for flood control, is \$251,575,000.

The totals in the bill as recommended by the conferees covering titles I and II only with the reductions effected by the conferees are as follows:

Action of conferees on H. R. 5472

RIVERS AND HARBORS—TITLE I

Total as passed by House.....	\$119,469,975	
Added by Senate.....	108,903,150	
Total House and Senate.....		\$228,373,125
Reductions made by conferees:		
Ouachita River (from \$36,950,000 to \$21,300,000).....	\$15,650,000	
Arkansas River (from \$89,000,000 to \$80,000,000).....	9,000,000	
		24,650,000
Total river and harbor as reported from conference.....		203,723,125

FLOOD CONTROL—TITLE II

Total as passed by House.....	\$998,116,200	
Added by Senate (includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on Rio Grande).....	366,384,000	
Total House and Senate.....		1,364,500,200
Reductions made by conferees:		
Hartwell Reservoir (from \$68,377,000 to \$50,000,000).....	\$18,377,000	
Columbia River Basin (following items added by Senate were deleted by conferees):		
Modification of Fern Ridge Dam, Oreg.....	\$133,000	
Willamette River supplemental levees and overflow channel enclosures (no effect on monetary authorizations).....	0	
Hepner Dam and downstream channel improvements, Willow Creek, Oreg.....	3,771,000	
Harbors at 21 locations, Oregon, Washington, Idaho.....	2,300,000	
Local flood protection projects reduced from \$28,000,000 to \$15,000,000.....	13,000,000	
Reduction in general authorization.....	47,049,000	
Total reductions in Columbia River Basin (\$141,253,000 to \$75,000,000).....	66,253,000	
Total reductions by conferees.....		84,630,000
Total flood control as reported from conference (includes \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on Rio Grande).....		1,279,870,200
Total title I and title II.....		1,483,593,325
Total excluding \$30,179,000 for reclamation work on Rio Grande.....		1,453,414,325
Total reductions by conferees—title I and title II.....		109,280,000

This omnibus authorization bill, H. R. 5472, for rivers and harbors and flood control covers the entire United States. I am particularly interested in it as it involves the great natural resources of the Columbia River Basin. As a member of the Public Works Committee which approved this bill in the House in the last session and by reason of being ranking member on the Flood Control Subcommittee, I was appointed by the Speaker as one of the conferees to consider the disagreeing votes between the House and the Senate on this bill.

There is included in the House bill a number of essential projects not only for the development of our natural resources in the Pacific Northwest area but also for flood control. These included the Albeni Falls Dam on the Columbia River in Idaho, which will firm up power in Bonneville and Grand Coulee and be the most available project for early completion to help meet the power shortage in the Portland area. The House bill also contained \$40,000,000 additional authorization for the Willamette Basin projects, authorization for the Johnson Creek project in the Portland area, levees on the Willamette River to protect Portland, at an estimated cost of \$14,722,000,000; lower Columbia bank protection and modification of levees along the lower Columbia, aggregating \$22,595,000. The total for Columbia River projects as the bill passed the House amounts to \$107,997,000. These items were unchanged by the Senate.

At the time the House bill was reported out of committee, the comprehensive 308 report had not been released by the Budget Bureau and therefore the House was unable to consider the projects contained in it. However, when the Public Works Committee of the Senate considered the bill recently this report had been released and the Senate included a number of additional projects in the Columbia River area, including the Willamette River. There were projects in disagreement considered by the conferees. The conferees approved all of these projects which had been approved by the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. They cover with a few exceptions all of the projects in the Columbia River Basin and Willamette River Basin which were to be constructed by the Army engineers and which were included in the comprehensive 308 report, providing for the long-range development of the resources of the Columbia River Basin. In addition to the approval of the projects themselves there was approved a monetary authorization for partial construction and for planning, the sum of \$75,000,000. This sum was a reduction from the amount authorized in the Senate amendments, but was in keeping with reductions made in other projects in the bill in order to bring the total amount of the bill to a minimum in monetary authorizations. The Army engineers advised me that this reduction in monetary authorizations will not militate against our interests in these developments. They are long-range developments extending over a number of years and additional authorizations can be made from time to time as

needed as the over-all program is developed by the Army engineers.

The authorizations in the Columbia and Willamette River areas added by the Senate and now approved by the conferees are as follows:

Power facilities at Lookout Point Dam, middle fork of the Willamette River.

Hills Creek Dam, middle fork of the Willamette River.

Dexter reregulating dam, middle fork, Willamette River.

Waldo Lake Tunnel and regulating works, middle-north fork, Willamette River.

Fall Creek Dam, Fall Creek, middle fork, Willamette River.

Holley Dam, Calapooya River.

Willamette Falls fish ladder, Willamette River.

Willamette River channel improvements, bank protection works, and channel clearing and snagging.

Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Mont.

Priest Rapids Dam, Columbia River, Wash.

John Day Dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Ore.

The Dalles Dam, Columbia River, Wash. and Ore.

Local flood-protection project at Pendleton, and Jackson Hole, Wyo.

Local flood-protection projects in the Columbia River Basin, Mont., Wyo., Utah, Nev., Idaho, Ore., and Wash., provided that with respect to these local flood-protection projects the following conditions shall apply:

First. Not to exceed \$15,000,000 of this authorization shall be available for these local flood-protection projects.

Second. All of the local flood-protection projects undertaken pursuant to this item shall be economically justified prior to construction.

Third. Local cooperation specified in the flood-control act approved June 22, 1936, as amended, shall be required.

During the 12 years I have served Oregon here in the Congress I have devoted a major portion of my time to the development, conservation, and utilization of the great natural resources of the Columbia River Basin, particularly as they appertain to power development, navigation, reclamation, and water utilization. The Columbia River, the second greatest in the United States and the greatest in power potentialities, is the cornerstone of the economy of the whole Northwest area. Its full development and utilization not only means success to industries in providing pay rolls, but also is a great boon to agricultural development and land utilization. Over 40 percent of the hydroelectric power of our Nation is bottled up in this great river and only about 10 percent of it has been developed thus far. These authorizations in this bill cover projects which, when constructed, will put the Northwest in the forefront of hydro-power development. It should not be overlooked that these great power developments are self-sustaining and every dollar with interest invested in them by the Federal Government is repaid in full. In fact, Bonneville is 10 years ahead of schedule in its repayment programs. The Federal Government should spend more money on

these projects which pay their own way and curtail expenditures in many of the activities which it has been carrying on of doubtful worth and which make no returns to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am a sincere advocate of economy in Federal expenditures and believe that we should cut out every expenditure which is not essential for the best interests of our country at this critical time. However, I do feel that it would be a grievous mistake to fail to make adequate appropriations for the conservation, development, and utilization of the great natural resources of our Nation upon which the very economy of our country depends. Unless we utilize these resources to the greatest economical extent we will not be able to meet our commitments at home and abroad and meet the ever-increasing financial obligations resting upon the Federal Government. For that reason I sincerely urge the approval of this conference report so that these great internal improvements in our country may be carried forward efficiently and expeditiously in order to maintain the economy of the Nation. Many of the projects, particularly those involving hydroelectric power, are self-liquidating and in the long run will repay the Federal Government all the moneys expended thereon.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I well recall last fall, in the first session of the Congress, when we had given consideration to this flood-control bill and had taken a wide range of testimony, then we drafted the bill. After we drafted the bill, the illustrious chairman of this committee will recall that we then went into executive session again, and we attempted to reduce, in every paragraph of this bill, every dollar that could possibly be cut out of it. That is exactly what we did. We reduced it by many millions. Then it went to the Senate. It has recently been acted upon by the Senate and is now before the House on a conference report. It is true the Senate added some few million dollars, because they were not able to get their testimony in earlier, but the entire, over-all bill at the present time amounts to a little less than \$1,500,000,000. Naturally, we would like to make some reductions that were written in by the other body, but it is the consensus of the leadership, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] that it would be futile to make these reductions and send it back to the Senate because they would put the amount back and we would have the bill in conference again. But when you consider this is spread over a 3-year period, we would be spending about \$500,000,000 a year to protect the cities and towns and villages and the rich farm land in the valleys in the entire Nation, it is certainly an investment that will pay off in big dividends.

If we do not pass this bill, we give no relief to our people at home. Do you know we are probably spending, through the ECA in other countries over the world, for flood control, industrialization

of plants, and so forth, amounts running to over a billion dollars a year. Here we are asking for flood control for this great country of ours only about \$500,000,000 a year, when you consider it is spread over a 3-year period. Let us do this much for our own people in protecting our own resources. We had better do this and cut down on our overseas spending.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable apprehension that I find that in the final draft of the flood-control bill, as embodied in the provisions of the conference report, the appropriation for the revetments and flood protection at Bonner's Ferry, Idaho, have been left out. That means that if we do not build the Libby Dam first and protect the extensive areas behind the levees in the diking districts of the Kootenai Valley at Bonner's Ferry, by striking out that appropriation, that country will be left to the mercy of the floods of Kootenai River. We must build the Libby Dam first, to take care of and protect the rich farming land in that valley.

I hope some subsequent appropriation will be made to take care of Bonner's Ferry and the Kootenai Valley district, since they have been left out of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere regrets that our very distinguished and able friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] will not be a candidate again for Congress. As chairman of the Public Works Committee he will be greatly missed. His long years of experience in the Congress, particularly on rivers and harbors, eminently qualified him for the chairmanship of this great committee. He has been a willing servant of public duty, conscientiously performing his work with energy and resourcefulness on all public matters that were before him.

Over the years he has turned in a remarkable performance of which he can well be proud. He has been fair and square and tolerant and patient with us on all of the many problems that have been presented to him. His work has won for him the hearty commendations, respect, and admiration of the membership of both sides of the aisle. He is an outstanding American and I regret that he is leaving the Congress of the United States.

Now I want to say a word to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. I might tell the very distinguished gentleman that if he will look after his own State of Mississippi, we who represent Pennsylvania, will look after the affairs of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania is a great State of 10,000,000

people, a State that sent 1,400,000 men and women into the last World War, a State that produced some 30 to 35 percent of the war materials, a State that has a magnificent record. Nature has blessed Pennsylvania with great natural resources—coal, oil and gas. We are the leading steel-producing State in the Nation and we have built a great system of highways, waterways, and railways. We have the finest workmen in the world. We are one of the leading agricultural States in the Union. All these factors combine to make our State the industrial titan of America. This great State of ours built soundly and well on the foundation of free enterprise—the American way.

Pennsylvania pays into the Federal Treasury approximately 10 percent of all the taxes collected by the Federal Government. So if the TVA, about which the gentleman is talking, cost \$800,000,000, Pennsylvania has contributed \$80,000,000 to make possible the development of the TVA to produce cheap power for the industrial rehabilitation and protection of the Tennessee Valley. Instead of being critical of the great State of Pennsylvania, which I am proud and honored to represent, I think the gentleman from Mississippi should be paying tribute to us as a great State because without our energy, industry, and resourcefulness, and without our great natural resources and without our tremendous contribution to the Federal Treasury TVA would not have been possible.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I shall find it necessary to vote against this conference report on rivers and harbors and flood control. It amounts, according to figures submitted, to \$1,538,044,325, of which \$228,300,000 is for rivers and harbors, and \$1,334,000,000 for flood control.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I am in favor of flood control, and I am in favor of the improvement of the rivers and harbors in this country where it is the obligation of the Federal Government to appropriate funds for that purpose. However, I want to direct your attention to this particular bill.

As near as I can figure it out, this bill has been increased by the Senate to the extent of \$335,828,150. In other words, after the bill was voted by the House it went to the other body, where more than a third of a billion dollars was added. Not only that, but these items, making up \$335,000,000, were not even considered or debated in the House of Representatives and were not considered by the House Committee on Public Works, except over a period of about 2 days. So the situation is this: The House, upon the recommendation of the Public Works Committee, after prolonged hearings were held, approved a bill amounting to a billion dollars. Then it went to the Senate, where a half billion dollars was added, and the House has reduced the Senate increase about 30 percent, leaving a net increase of \$335,000,000 that was put in by the Senate and is about to be approved by the House without any debate and without hearings in the House committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a real "pork barrel" bill. There is something in it for almost every area and every section of the country. I wish I had time to read the items to you, but you will find them—East, West, North, and South, Middle States, and all.

Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that where projects have been started and are presently under way, those projects should be completed in regular order. There may be a few additional projects because of critical circumstances that ought to be considered, but I call your attention to the fact that more than one-half of the amount allocated under this bill is for new projects of various kinds that have not yet been started, and you know that when a project is once authorized and some allocations are made, the Federal Government is obligated to continue and complete such projects. So let no one misunderstand that when you vote for this bill today, you are obligating your Government for another \$1,500,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to obligate the Federal Treasury and the taxpayers of this country for any amount more than is absolutely necessary, and these authorizations should be made in consideration of absolute need and not on the basis of the demand for the authorization and expenditure of more and more funds.

I concede that many of these projects are worthy and are entitled to every reasonable consideration that may be granted, but in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury, and considering the fact that our expenditures during the fiscal year will be \$6,000,000,000 more than our revenue, the fair and reasonable thing to do is to send this bill back to the committee for further consideration.

It is not fair, neither is it right, that this House should be called upon to authorize the expenditure of such a tremendous amount of money, a great part of which was never debated in the House and barely considered by the great House Committee on Public Works. I know it will be said that this only authorizes the expenditure of funds, but Members of this House know full well that once you authorize and obligate your Government, you are expected to appropriate funds to pay the bill. This is too much money. I shall vote against the conference report.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD. Having no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 101, noes 33.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 210, nays 137, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—210

Abernethy	Gathings	Monroney
Addonizio	Gavin	Morris
Albert	Gillette	Multer
Allen, Calif.	Golden	Murdock
Allen, Ill.	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Granahan	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Granger	Norblad
Angell	Green	Norrell
Aspinall	Gregory	Norton
Auchincloss	Gross	O'Konski
Bailey	Hagen	O'Neill
Barden	Hale	O'Sullivan
Baring	Hardy	Passman
Barrett, Pa.	Hare	Patman
Barrett, Wyo.	Harris	Patten
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Perkins
Beckworth	Havenner	Peterson
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ark.	Philbin
Bentsen	Hébert	Phillips, Calif.
Bishop	Hedrick	Phillips, Tenn.
Blackney	Heffernan	Potter
Blatnik	Herlong	Poulson
Boggs, La.	Hill	Preston
Bolton, Md.	Hinshaw	Price
Bonner	Hobbs	Priest
Bosone	Hoeven	Rankin
Bramblett	Hollifield	Redden
Brooks	Holmes	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Horan	Richards
Bryson	Howell	Rivers
Buchanan	Hull	Rodino
Buckley, Ill.	Jackson, Wash.	Rooney
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenison	Roosevelt
Burdick	Jensen	Sadowski
Burnside	Johnson	Sanborn
Camp	Jones, Mo.	Saylor
Carnahan	Karst	Scudder
Carroll	Kearns	Secrest
Case, S. Dak.	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Sikes
Chlperfield	Kerr	Simpson, Ill.
Christopher	Kilday	Spence
Colmer	King	Staggers
Combs	Kirwan	Stefan
Cooper	Lane	Stigler
Corbett	Lanham	Stockman
Cox	Larcade	Sullivan
Cunningham	LeCompte	Tackett
Curtis	Lemke	Talle
Davenport	Lovre	Thomas
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Thompson
Davis, Tenn.	Lyle	Thornberry
D'Ewart	Lynch	Tollefson
Dollinger	McCormack	Trimble
Dolliver	McDonough	Vinson
Dondero	McGuire	Vursell
Donchue	McKinnon	Weich
Doyle	McMillan, S. C.	Wardel
Eberhart	Mack, Wash.	White, Idaho
Ellsworth	Magee	Whitten
Engel, Mich.	Mansfield	Whittington
Evins	Marcantonio	Williams
Fenton	Marsalis	Willis
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	Wilson, Tex.
Flood	Merrow	Winstead
Forand	Meyer	Withrow
Frazier	Michener	Wolcott
Fugate	Miller, Calif.	Wood
Fulton	Mills	Woodhouse
Furcolo	Mitchell	

NAYS—137

Abbitt	Canfield	Eaton
Andersen,	Cannon	Elston
H. Carl	Case, N. J.	Fallon
Andersen,	Celler	Feighan
August H.	Chatham	Fellows
Arends	Chesney	Fogarty
Bates, Mass.	Clemente	Ford
Beall	Clevenger	Garmatz
Biemiller	Cole, Kans.	Gary
Boggs, Del.	Cole, N. Y.	Gordon
Bolling	Cotton	Gorski
Bolton, Ohio	Coudert	Graham
Brehm	Crawford	Gwinn
Brown, Ohio	Dague	Hall
Bulwinkle	Davis, Wis.	Edwin Arthur
Burleson	Delaney	Halleck
Burton	Doughton	Hand
Byrnes, Wis.	Durham	Harrison

Harvey	McCulloch	Scott, Hardie
Hays, Ohio	McGregor	Scott,
Herter	Mack, Ill.	Hugh D., Jr.
Hesseltun	Macy	Scrivner
Hoffman, Mich.	Mahon	Shaffer
Hope	Marshall	Simpson, Pa.
Huber	Martin, Mass.	Sims
Irving	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Jackson, Calif.	Miller, Md.	Smith, Va.
James	Morton	Smith, Wis.
Javits	Murray, Wis.	Stanley
Jennings	Nelson	Steed
Jonas	O'Brien, Ill.	Taber
Jones, N. C.	O'Hara, Ill.	Tauriello
Judd	O'Toole	Teague
Karsten	Patterson	Towe
Kearney	Pickett	Van Zandt
Keating	Poage	Vorys
Kennedy	Polk	Wagner
Kilburn	Rabaut	Walter
Latham	Reed, N. Y.	Weichel
Norton	Rees	Widnall
LeFevre	Ribicoff	Wier
Lesinski	Rich	Wigglesworth
Lichtenwalter	Richman	Wilson, Okla.
Lind	Rogers, Mass.	Wolverton
Linehan	Sadlak	Yates
Lodge	St. George	Young
McCarthy	Sasscer	Zablocki
McConnell		

NOT VOTING—83

Andrews	Harden	Pfeiffer,
Battle	Heller	William L.
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Ill.	Plumley
Boydin	Jacobs	Powell
Breen	Jenkins	Quinn
Burke	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Byrne, N. Y.	Kean	Ramsay
Carlyle	Kee	Regan
Cavalcante	Keefe	Rhodes
Chudoff	Keogh	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Klein	Sabath
Crook	Kruse	Shelley
Crosser	Kunkel	Short
Davies, N. Y.	McGrath	Smathers
Dawson	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Deane	McSweeney	Sutton
DeGraffenried	Madden	Taylor
Denton	Miles	Underwood
Dingell	Miller, Nebr.	Velde
Douglas	Morgan	Wadsworth
Elliot	Morrison	Walsh
Engle, Calif.	Moulder	Wheeler
Fisher	Nixon	Whitaker
Gamble	Noland	White, Calif.
Gilmer	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Goodwin	O'Hara, Minn.	Wilson, Ind.
Gossett	Pace	Woodruff
Grant	Pfeifer,	
Hall,	Joseph L.	

Leonard W.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smathers for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Short against.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeiffer for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Kean against.

Mr. Gilmer for, with Mr. Davies of New York against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Goodwin.

Mr. Rhodes with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. McGrath with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Burke with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Battle with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Crook with Mrs. Harden.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Dean with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. White of California with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SASSCER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. KARSTEN, Mr. JACKSON of California, and Mr. WAGNER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in each include an editorial.

Mr. CLEVELER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include an article.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include certain information.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Alvin Bloch on the subject Cargoes and Pacific Northwest Power.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Brooklyn Eagle.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include two articles.

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the magazine Machinists.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include two editorials.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a speech commemorating the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "Congressional Subpena Upon the President."

Mr. GORSKI, Mr. CHESNEY, and Mr. ELSTON asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of the bill entitled "Niagara Redevelopment Act of 1950" and an analysis of the bill.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in five instances and in each include extraneous matter.

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1951

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7786, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

CHAPTER VII. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The CHAIRMAN. General debate on all chapters of the bill has been concluded.

The Clerk will now continue reading the bill for amendments, beginning with chapter VII, page 216, line 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

WORKING-CAPITAL FUND

For establishment of a working-capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of (1) a central reproduction service; (2) communication services; (3) a central supply service for stationery, supplies, equipment, blank forms, and miscellaneous materials, for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part requirements of the bureaus and offices of the Department in the city of Washington and elsewhere; (4) a central library service; (5) health services; and (6) such other similar service functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis; \$300,000. Said fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of bureaus, offices, and agencies for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 217, lines 4 to 6, beginning with the figure "6," and reading as follows:

(6) such other similar service functions as the Secretary determines may be performed more advantageously on a reimbursable basis.

I ask leave to reserve the point of order and to propound a question of the chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Will the chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking mi-

nority member of the committee explain the purpose of this provision?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman, may I say that the purpose of this language is to centralize the service functions within the department of the office of the Secretary. It does not involve any additional expenditures. Frankly, the purpose of it is to save money.

Mr. KEATING. Has this language been carried in previous appropriation bills?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The identical language has not been carried before, but the substance has been very much the same.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, to remain available until expended, \$10,350,000, of which not to exceed \$5,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head "Construction, operation, and maintenance, power transmission facilities" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 218, starting in line 5, reading as follows: "And, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$6,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of funds appropriated under the head 'Construction, operation, and maintenance, power-transmission facilities' in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, for the foregoing purposes shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation" on the ground it involves legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this is the same thing that has been happening around here for several years and occurs every time we have reached the item covering the Southwestern Power Administration. I think every Member of the Committee will agree with me when I say that the Southwestern Power Administration has given one demonstration in the United States of America where the Government and private industry can get along.

About 2 or 3 years ago the Southwestern Power Administration and the Department of the Interior made a contract with the Texas Power & Light Co.

for the interchange and the distribution of power at this place. It is one contract that the Southwestern Power Administration has lived up to 100 percent and that the Texas Power & Light Co. has lived up to 100 percent. It has been a valuable contract both for the Government and for the Texas Power & Light Co., and neither the Government nor the Texas Power & Light Co. would for a moment think of doing away with that contract today.

The Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration sat down with the utilities of the State of Oklahoma and they have drawn a contract that the utilities themselves are very much for and that the Southwestern Power Administration is also for. That contract is on the desk of the Secretary of the Interior now. If it is signed the \$6,000,000 provided for in this bill will not be expended because instead of building these lines there will be a contract between them.

When this thing first came up for consideration here I stood up on the floor of this House and said: "I do not believe in the confiscation of property."

There is a certain group of people in the United States who do not think there ought to be any public power. There is another group that does not think there ought to be any private power. I do not belong to either group. If we are allowed to, we are going to endeavor to make a satisfactory contract with every power company in that part of the country that, as I say, will be mutually beneficial to the Government and beneficial to the power companies themselves.

We have never paralleled a line of any power company. I made the statement here, and let me repeat, that I am not out to confiscate anybody's property, that where the power companies with an existing line had the capacity to carry the power of the Southwestern Power Administration and would carry it at a reasonable rate, that we would not parallel or build any line adjacent thereto, and that has not been done in one instance in the State of Texas where the Texas Power & Light Co. operates. We hope to get that same kind of an arrangement in Oklahoma, and we will have it if this contract that is now lying on the desk of the Secretary of the Interior is approved by him.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say that the distinguished Speaker has explained this matter exactly and in accordance with the facts, and that we are, as the gentleman has just explained, working out a very satisfactory program between the Southwestern Power Administration and the private utilities in the Southwest area. Now, for the first time in the history of this Nation, do we have a working agreement that is going to be good for everyone concerned. I am happy to say that the Speaker and I see this thing exactly alike. As the Speaker has just said, there are some folks who think

there should be no public power and there are some folks who think there should be no private power. The Speaker and I belong to neither one of those groups. Certainly, by striking this out, it would interfere with the program that we have in progress now and we are working out and solving these differences which have bothered us for years and years. I am sorry the gentleman from New York made the point of order, and I hope he will withdraw it.

Mr. RAYBURN. I trust that under the circumstances the gentleman may feel that he could, in good conscience, withdraw his point of order, because, following up exactly what the gentleman from Iowa has said, we are trying to make things work down in the Southwest, and as far as we have been able to go, they are working.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished Speaker yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I associate myself with the views of the Speaker and the gentleman from Iowa in reference to public and private power. Do I understand from the Speaker that, if the negotiations pending are concluded, that this \$6,000,000 contract authority will not be exercised?

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman is right. The Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration stated before both a House committee and a Senate committee that, if this contract was signed, this money would not be expended.

Mr. KEATING. And the Speaker, from his knowledge of this situation, would be led to believe that the contract is likely to be signed?

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, I hope that the contract is signed. I have seen it; I have gone over it very thoroughly, as I did the Texas Power & Light Co. contract. I think it is a good contract, and I trust that the Secretary of the Interior does sign it.

Mr. KEATING. This particular contract authority would only need to be exercised in the event the contract did not come into being.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I would like to reserve it further, if I may.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. I did not hear the point of order submitted, Mr. Chairman, but I fail to see where the debate we have had up to this time touches on any point of order. Merely as a matter of information, what is the purpose of the debate?

Mr. RAYBURN. The purpose of this debate was that I was hoping, feeling that I was right, that I could prevail upon the gentleman from New York to withdraw his point of order. That was the purpose of my taking the floor for

the only time I have taken it in the 2 or 3 weeks since this bill has been under consideration.

Mr. CANNON. I am told that the Secretary and the friends of REA are opposed to the Texas contract and do not think it ought to be signed in this form.

Mr. RAYBURN. It does not make any difference to anybody whether or not they are opposed to the Texas contract. It has been in operation for more than 2 years.

The Secretary of the Interior found some parts of the contract to which he is objecting. I am trusting that Mr. Wright and the power companies can get together and yet bring about an amendment to that contract that the Secretary of the Interior will sign.

Mr. CANNON. I am not familiar with the merits of the various forms of contract but it is my understanding that the cooperatives in my State and other States do not favor the Texas contract and as a result this particular contract has been on the desk of the Secretary for many weeks; for a very long time, at least.

Mr. RAYBURN. It has not been there a very long time. I hope the gentleman does not get me into personalities, but I know there is one man in the country that claims to represent the co-ops of the country, but the principal thing he is doing is going around stirring up trouble between the Southwestern Power Administration and the co-ops of the country. He is performing no service, in my opinion, either to public power or to the co-ops.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. May I say to the Speaker and to the House that I think you know how I have felt all along about public and private power. They tell me the Texas contract has acted decently, and has been a constructive step in the relationship of public and private power. It was a good step.

The Speaker is correct when he says that the Oklahoma utilities will enter this same contract. May I say to the Speaker that the Arkansas utilities will do the same thing.

I join the Speaker in asking that this contract, similar to the Texas contract, be approved by the Secretary of the Interior regardless of what somebody may say because, as the Speaker has so well said, some people want to take over the whole thing and make it public, while others would not have any public power at all. As the solution is reached here, public and private power can live together, if the Interior Department will be governed by what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has said.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I join my colleagues in saying that Mr. Wright made a very fine presentation to the subcommittee. Everything the Speaker has said is absolutely true, because I took occasion to

call up the Secretary of the Interior a day or two ago and ask him the status of the various contracts that were on his table. He said he was hopeful that very shortly he could make final arrangements for those contracts.

Mr. Douglas Wright is to be commended on his explanation. He made a very fine presentation. Of course, he has taken the position that we do, that where private enterprise can supply power it should be supplied by them, and the same goes for transmission lines. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Texas will try to expedite these contracts so that we can protect free enterprise in this business.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is what the gentleman from Texas is trying to do.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I want first to make clear that I am not claiming to speak for all the REA cooperatives throughout the Nation. I have felt that they have done great work, their leadership was good, and that I do not claim to have done more than my share, but there have been times when I have tried to be as helpful toward this program as possible. I do, therefore, believe I can fairly speak as a friend of the REA program and as one who lives in the area that is served by the Texas Power & Light Co. and by some of these REA-financed cooperatives and some public dams, and by one of the largest REA transmission cooperatives, I want to point out that the "Texas contract" has been working in our area over the past 2 years and that we now have the best relations between the private power companies, the public dams, and the REA cooperatives, both local and transmission cooperatives, that we have ever had. It seems to me that, under this contract, we have the assurance we are going to have all of these agencies working in cooperation without any duplication of effort or lines. A few years ago we had no cooperation and no way of getting the private companies to cooperate except to build competitive facilities. When we proved we could and would do just that the companies signed the Texas contract, and we are today enjoying the best of relations. If you deny the people of Oklahoma and Arkansas the bargaining power that this bill gives, I fear that you are going to force them into a useless war of duplication, which should be avoided.

Mr. RAYBURN. The contract has worked. We are getting plenty of power and getting it at reasonable rates.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman feel that to eliminate this provision would interfere with the negotiations and arrangements which are under way to which he has referred?

Mr. RAYBURN. It might take away from one side a little of its argument, I am afraid.

Mr. KEATING. In view of the representations of our Speaker, in whom we

all have so much confidence, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel I care to take the responsibility of striking this provision out on a point of order. If some other Member wishes to do so that is their privilege.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, some of the preceding speeches, unintentionally I am sure, have tended to becloud the issue. Some of the preceding speakers, both pro and con, have assumed that the provision in the pending bill to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has interposed a point of order in some way involves a conflict or controversy between the Southwestern Power Administration and private utility companies. This is completely erroneous. My colleague from Texas, the distinguished Speaker of the House, pointed out in the course of his speech that a contract has been negotiated between the Southwestern Power Administration and all of the utility companies of the area, which contract is now awaiting approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The contract is a lengthy one, and I have made no special study of it. But I have read it and understand the purpose it is intended to accomplish.

The contract in no wise gives private electric companies a monopoly on federally owned power. The effect is just the opposite. It would give priority to such preferred customers as REA and others which the Government desires to sell power from the federally owned generating plants and installations. What it would do is to intergrade the power transmission facilities owned by the Southwestern Power Administration and those owned by the private companies, thus making it unnecessary for the Government to spend large sums of money in the construction of transmission lines paralleling those of the private companies. These contracts have been strongly recommended by Mr. Douglas Wright of the Southwestern Power Administration. As has already been stated, Mr. Wright told the Appropriations Committee that if the contract is approved he will not need to spend a penny or contract for a penny of the \$5,000,000 authorized to which the point of order has been interposed. By intergrading the distribution system of the private companies and the Southwestern Power Administration millions of dollars will be saved to the public in the years ahead. It is foolish and wasteful to duplicate distribution systems when by proper cooperation and coordination it is wholly unnecessary.

The negotiation of the contract, in my judgment, is a fine thing. I think it will set a proper pattern for the distribution of public power. It will mark out the territory and proper field of service of such Government instrumentalities as Southwestern Power Administration and the private utility companies. I, for one, do not want to see private utility companies or other private enterprises absorbed or driven out of business by the Federal Government. On the other hand, power produced by these huge hydroelectric plants, made possible and

paid for by the taxpayers of the United States, belongs to all our people and should never be allowed either to be owned or monopolized by private concerns. I think the contracts in question point the way to a proper cooperation between the private companies and Government power corporations. It will mean cheaper and better electric service than either the Government or the private utility companies could supply alone. It is subject to Government regulation and supervision in the interest of the public good. The approval of the contract by the Secretary of Interior, and I sincerely trust he will approve it, will go a long way to stop the clamor of those who argue that it is the purpose of the Government to take over or socialize the private utility business. And it will, in my judgment, work to the great benefit of the users of electric power and to the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825a), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$760,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with what has been said about my distinguished friend Clyde Ellis, former Member of the House, and the association which he represents.

This is public power that is generated by the Southwest Power Administration. It is created by the Government and belongs to the public.

We had the same battle in the Tennessee Valley. If we had capitulated and turned it over to the Electric Bond & Share, and that is who the Texas Power & Light Co. is, we would be paying through the nose for our electricity today.

The State that ought to have the cheapest electricity on earth is the State of Texas. They have natural gas spouting into thin air, enough to generate electricity for four or five States the size of Texas. They also have an abundance of oil to run all the Diesel engines necessary to supply electricity to the people of Texas. Yet, I want to read you the statistics for 1948. In 1948 the State of Texas used 8,484,641,000 kilowatt hours of electricity for which it paid \$165,000,000. That is the ultimate consumers paid \$165,000,000. Under the TVA rate they would have paid \$86,000,000 and would have saved about \$78,000,000. I know some of you will say that the TVA pays no taxes. We pay more money in lieu of taxes than was paid by the private power company before the TVA was established.

In 1948 the people of Texas used 8,484,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity, and the people of Tennessee used 4,348,000,000 kilowatt hours. The people of Tennessee paid \$68,000,000 for their electricity, and the people of Texas paid \$165,000,000, or \$97,000,000 more than did the people of Tennessee.

Let us see what would happen under the Tacoma, Wash., rates. I have used Tacoma, Wash., for years, because it is one city in America which has a public power system operated by water power generated at dams 100 miles around the city. Tacoma has built her own dams. Instead of paying \$165,000,000 for that power, the people of Texas, under Tacoma rates, would have paid \$74,000,000, or about \$90,000,000 less than they did pay. They would have paid \$82,000,000 under the Ontario and would have saved about the same amount—\$82,000,000.

I do not agree that this power should be monopolized by the Electric Bond & Share Co. I know what the Electric Bond & Share Co. is, because I have had to fight them in Mississippi. They do not own an insulator in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if the area in which Tacoma, Wash., is located is not the only area that had a power shortage during the war and after the war.

Mr. RANKIN. The area in which Tacoma is located did what they did on the Tennessee River. They helped produce the atomic bomb. If it had not been for the Columbia River development and the Tennessee Valley Authority, there would not have been any atomic bomb. The reason was that they put these enterprises there because they had the power; and because they used more than anybody thought they would use, there was a shortage in some of the area.

Mr. NORRELL. There was a power shortage.

Mr. RANKIN. Not in Tacoma, Wash., where they have their own power facilities.

The situation in Arkansas is worse than it is in Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] spends considerable time at every opportunity telling you people how much money you are losing by allowing private enterprise to survive. He tells you exactly how many dollars you could save on your electric bill if the Government owned and sold all of the electricity. He could just as easily tell you that you could buy your clothes a lot cheaper at a Government-owned clothing store that is free from taxation and is being subsidized by the taxpayers. There is not one speck of difference in the arguments.

Those who would have public power and drive private enterprise out of the field are the same ones that would like to see the Federal Government run and own everything in this whole country.

I was amused the other day when the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] jumped up on the floor of the House during the farm-program debate and said, "If you keep going like you are going now, it is not going to be long until the Federal Government is going to be telling you farmers exactly how many

hogs you can raise, how many chickens you can feed, and how many cows you can milk." He was exactly right at that time. But when public power is concerned he does not seem to care if the rural people of this country are regimented even by a contract circumventing the wishes of those people, and their Congress. You notice he never could find Arkansas in his list of mistreated people because of high rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. Not now. You have had the floor ever since I have been here. The little rural electric co-ops in the Tennessee Valley are paying more for their electricity than they are in Arkansas. The cheapest electricity to the rural co-ops in the whole United States of America is in the State of Arkansas, and we do not have any Tennessee Valley Authority that is dodging taxes and having their accounts so hidden that you cannot tell what it costs to make electricity.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Douglas Wright testified before my subcommittee that the utilities in Arkansas, especially in my area, were selling power cheaper to the REA than the Southwest Power Administration could sell or the TVA. That is in the public hearings.

Mr. TACKETT. And that is exactly correct. The electricity being sold to the co-ops in my district is sold at between 4.6 mills and 4.9 mills. Can you buy it like that over in the Tennessee Valley?

Mr. RANKIN. I will give you the figures. The residential consumers of Arkansas last year paid \$10,260.00 for electricity which, under the TVA yardstick would have cost \$4,980,000. In other words, they paid a hundred percent more than they should.

Mr. TACKETT. What would they have paid for it from the Federal Government?

Mr. RANKIN. They would have paid just what I am talking about. You are plundering the ultimate consumers of electricity all over the State of Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. What would they have paid for it?

Mr. RANKIN. They would have paid a whole lot less than they paid in Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman does not know what electricity is selling for and does not seem to care; he is just trying to fool the people. TVA does not and cannot sell electricity for 4.6 or 4.9 mills.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Arkansas does not seem to realize the difference between public and private business.

Mr. TACKETT. I think I have sense enough to know that if the Federal Government is running something for the people that it is public business. When private people in this country get out here and compete on the theory of supply and demand, that is the kind of business that has made this the greatest country upon the face of the earth,

but it cannot be for long if we are going to permit the Federal Government to gobble up the business of the people of this country. Did the gentleman from Iowa want me to yield to him?

Mr. JENSEN. I think it might be well to point out that private industry, whether it be private utilities, the farmer, the peanut vendor on the corner, the corner grocery store, or anything else, pays taxes, and if it were not for those taxes coming into the Federal Government, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated a while ago, there would be no money to build these great things like TVA. The private utility companies last year paid over \$650,000,000 in local, State, and Federal taxes. That is considerably more than what the gentleman from Mississippi said, and all the figures he puts in the Record trying to prove benefit to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman from Mississippi, if the gentleman will pardon me, has proved one thing, that the Federal Government without paying taxes, that the Federal Government being subsidized by the taxpayers, that the Federal Government by hiding the figures that it actually costs to produce electricity can sell electricity cheaper than private enterprise can produce and sell it. That is exactly what he said; and the same thing is true of groceries, clothing, or anything else. I am wondering how the gentleman proposes to operate this Government after taxpaying enterprise has been abolished.

I should like to call your attention for just a moment to the Southwestern Power Administration. It came before this House and asked for money to build steam power generating units and transmission lines. Congress said: "No; we are not going to put the Federal Government into competition with private enterprise; we still believe in the principles of democracy."

They came back again and they said: "We have got to have the money to build steam-power units and transmission lines because there is just so much water coming down the river at certain seasons of the year; we need to firm up the power and sell it the year round."

Congress said: "No; we are still not going to build a TVA all over the United States."

Then, what did the Southwestern Power Administration do? They oozed over here and got hold of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's executive manager from my great State of Arkansas, Mr. Clyde Ellis. They said: "Now, Clyde, we cannot get Congress to go along with us, but we can work out a deal here whereby we can circumvent the very Congress that is refusing to go along with us. Here is what we will do: Let us enter into a contract whereby rural co-ops will build electric generating

and transmission facilities for the use and benefit of the Southwestern Power Administration. We will pretend that those facilities are for the use and benefit of the co-ops, and thereby circumvent Congress and fool the people. Mr. Wickard will do whatever you want him to do; he has a blank check provided by Congress to do whatever needs to be done for the REA program. You ask for loans to build some facilities down there in the State of Arkansas and elsewhere. Then you go in there and build for the SPA some steam power units and transmission lines that Congress would not give us, and then the Southwestern Power Administration will use those generating facilities and transmission lines for a period of 40 years for a certain rent to be paid by the taxpayers that will retire the construction cost. Southwestern Power Administration is all set to operate and to buy those transmission lines from the date they are constructed. The generating facilities will be worn out before they are paid for, but we will have the transmission facilities and be well on our way toward the abolishment of private enterprise."

The SPA gets the money from the taxpayers through the continuing fund to carry out the very thing the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is working for, the abolition of free enterprise in the power field. That contract even provides, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi who has been fighting FEPC with all the power at his command, for the civil-rights program, including the FEPC features so detested by the gentleman from Mississippi. If the gentleman would read what he is hollering about, he would not be so condescending of the public-power contract. That contract provides that the Southwestern Power Administration shall determine the policies of the little rural electric co-ops in your State and in my State. In other words, that little group of rural electric co-op board members will no longer determine the policies; and the wishes of the little co-ops will not amount to a tinker's hoot because the Federal Government through the Southwestern Power Administration is going to socialize, federalize, and nationalize the electric industry and regiment the farmers of this country to such an extent that it will not be long until the Government is going to be telling the farmers, as you have predicted Mr. RANKIN, how many chickens they can feed, how many hogs they can raise, and how many cows they can milk.

I wish that the gentleman, if he actually believes in what he has been saying in the past, would find out what the electrification program of the Southwestern Power Administration is actually doing to our rural people.

Mr. RANKIN. Doing them more good all the time. Public power is doing the people I represent more good than anything that has ever come along.

Mr. TACKETT. The gentleman is unable to distinguish public power from rural electrification. Public power is socialistic, while rural electrification is operating in free enterprise.

Mr. RANKIN. The Electric Bond & Share Co., which is a holding company, is bleeding the people of Arkansas and Texas to the extent of over \$150,000,000 a year in overcharges.

Mr. TACKETT. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi that every Socialist who has even advocated taking over the principles of democracy has advocated, first, taking over the electric-power systems, second, taking over the telephone and communication systems, and third, taking over the railroads and other transportation systems, the necessary steps to socialize America. The gentleman is helping them to climb these steps.

Mr. RANKIN. When I took this up in 1934—

Mr. TACKETT. That is popular, Mr. RANKIN, but it is not right and you know it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad we do not have something in the House to blow the smoke away so we could take a look around. We have just listened to a Power Trust speech so good that I doubt if anybody on the left-hand side of this aisle could equal it. I do not think I ever heard a better one from that standpoint.

There are a few little things I want to discuss that are happening out in Missouri. You know, we are not so far from Arkansas. In fact, I have been across the State line down there two different times at least. My REA co-op, the Osage Valley Electric co-op, is paying 1.6 for current wholesale right now, and I hope to be able to hitch on with a couple of lines in the State of Arkansas and get a little hydroelectric current up there so that we can reduce the price at wholesale.

We have had two steam plants authorized for our State and there has been quite a lot of objection to it. I want to tell you Members of the House something. Independence, which is the home of President Truman at the present time, is a suburb of Kansas City. When you drive out Truman Road you cannot tell when you are driving out of Kansas City and entering Independence. It is all one town.

The Kansas City Power & Light Co. has been one of the utilities that has been fighting the construction of these lines into Missouri and those two steam-generating plants on the Missouri River. But I want to tell you something. Independence, Mo., will not buy its current from the Kansas City Power & Light Co. although it is generated in the same city. Independence has its own municipal power and light plant and generates its own current. I do not know that the following is a fact but it is a suspicion of mine that the reason they do not buy current from the Kansas City Power & Light Co. is because they can build their own plant and generate their own current and save money. Those men in Independence are good hard-headed businessmen and they try to get a dollar's worth of current for every dollar they spend.

Let me tell you another thing. There are 41 other cities and towns in the State of Missouri that have their own municipal light plant and that generate their own current. Why? The only reason they do it is because they can do it cheaper than they can get the power from the Power Trust in Missouri. If it is all right for 42 cities and towns in the State of Missouri to generate the current they use and distribute it to their customers, why in the name of all things good is it wrong for all the farmers in all the State of Missouri to have two transmission lines and two generating plants? If it is all right for cities and towns in Missouri to have 42 generating plants why is it wrong for all the farmers in that great State to have two such plants?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] does not seem to know that the power business is a public business and that the clothing business is a private business. His argument is the same old "stuff" we heard when they were fighting against the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. If the Government was producing the wool that the clothes were made out of, we would have a case in point, but the Government does not.

Mr. RANKIN. We also heard the same stuff when they were fighting the development of the Columbia River. If we had not succeeded in those two enterprises the American people today would be paying from one to three billion dollars more for their electricity than they are paying.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. If the private power companies in the State of Missouri would sign a contract to sell to REA wholesale at 6 mills per kilowatt-hour and deliver the current to the points of need for a period of 20 years, we would not need the lines and we would not need the generating plants, but they will not do it. They have not done it, and they are not going to do it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman think that the REA's in Missouri are building those cooperative generating plants down there?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. They will be, if they get the money.

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman not know that the Federal Government, through the guise of the Southwestern Power Administration, will build them?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. And every dollar of the money will be repaid into the Federal Treasury with interest, so whose business is it?

Mr. TACKETT. Does the gentleman not know that it is not going to be repaid, as long as SPA takes the produced power and spend the proceeds from the sale there of nationalizing the electric industry? None of the proceeds from the sale of such electricity reaches the United States Treasury. Does the gen-

tleman know anything about what he is talking about?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The REA is already ahead on its entire schedule of payment and will pay for these lines and plants with interest. I do not know what the gentleman considers I know or I do not know, and I am not worried about his consideration along that line.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As a matter of fact, is not the gentleman from Arkansas, and the rest of the gentlemen, for that matter, talking about an entirely different contract? We started out talking about a contract between the power companies and the Southwestern Power Administration to use the power that is being generated by the Southwestern Power Administration. The gentleman from Arkansas is discussing a contract that somebody has with some local cooperative, or maybe it is a transmission cooperative down in the State of Oklahoma. We are talking about an entirely different contract; and when he is talking about whether or not it will be paid back, it will all be paid back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I would like to point out to the gentleman that I think the people in your State ought to build your generating plants yourselves. Why do you have to come and ask the Federal Government to do such work; if you need the power, build your own plants. Up in my State of Pennsylvania last year in the city of Warren, Pa., in my district, the Penelec Co. built a \$14,000,000 generating plant. They did not ask the State to help, and they did not ask the Federal Government to help. The need for power was evident. The plant was built. They put their own cash on the barrel head to do the job to furnish the power needed in the area.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. The Government put up the cash to build the White River Dam as a flood-control and generating project, and its cost will be repaid from the sale of current generated; and we have as much right to that current as the Arkansas Power & Light Co. has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to point out some facts to the gentleman in regard to the Arkansas Power & Light Co. There was never before gathered in America such a group of licensed burglars working for the Wall Street monopoly which owns the company as the group running the Arkansas Power & Light Co. for Electric Bond & Share. If the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] will read the hearings of the subcommittee for the Department of Interior of the House Appropriations Committee of which I was a member, I believe it was back in March of 1946 for fiscal year 1947, he will see ample justification for the statement that I make. The greatest thing that ever happened in the five great States of the Southwest has been the creation of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I thank the gentleman. I agree with him 100 percent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has said. What I am afraid of is this: I am afraid of these attempts to turn that power over to the power trust, that is the Electric Bond & Share, not the Arkansas Power & Light Co., not the Texas Power & Light Co., not the Louisiana Power & Light Co., not the Mississippi Power & Light Co.; it is the Electric Bond & Share, a holding company which is really owned in Wall Street, New York. And what I am afraid of is that they will bleed those people for this power, that is public power to begin with, and that the consumers should get at the lowest possible rate. I have been in this fight a long time. In 1933 I along with Senator NORRIS introduced a bill and fought it through to create the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. I led the drive here for rural electrification when Arkansas had 1.2 percent of her farms electrified. If we had lost that fight, there would not have been an electric light in the average home in Arkansas for the next 40 years. This is not a question of the Government going into private business; the power business is a public business. Our water power is public property, and we do not intend for it to be taken over and monopolized by the Power Trust.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield to me further, I wonder if the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr.

TACKETT] has ever heard of the acquisitions of properties by Ham Moses' Arkansas Power and Light in the State of Arkansas, where properties were acquired at one price and put on their books at a phony price which was millions and millions of dollars over the price at which they were actually acquired? The facts in regard to this may be found beginning at page 379 of part 3 of the hearings on the 1947 Interior appropriations bill.

I wonder if the gentleman from Arkansas knows that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. is well represented in every golf club in the State of Arkansas. Ham's boys are in every Chamber of Commerce, Lions Club, Kiwanis, and everything else. In a great number of instances the cost of dues and contributions is added to the farmers' electric bills. They sell the bill of goods that good old Arkansas Power & Light belongs to Arkansas, not Wall Street, New York, the real owner. In the interest of their alma mater, Electric Bond & Share, they have opposed the building of every dam and transmission line in the Southwest. Very few members from the State of Arkansas do not hear from the various organizations in which the Arkansas Power & Light is so well represented and from the newspapers in every town in which the Arkansas Power & Light advertises.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. The gentleman from New York is interested in Arkansas, and I am glad he is, and cheaper rates, but I just want to ask him what he is doing to get cheaper rates in New York and to clean out the crookedness in that State?

Mr. ROONEY. We are not as fortunate in New York in getting cheap power rates as the people are in the gentleman's State. I have always supported public power and the best interests of the people of Arkansas, as the gentleman well knows, from my service with him, in the subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations. There is no good reason why, if in my State we have to pay 7 and 8 times as much for electric power, I should take it out on the good people of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I just want to say to my distinguished friend from New York, too, that there is no reason why the taxpayers of Pennsylvania should put their money up to build power plants all over the United States.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, while some of these gentlemen are taking credit for having brought electricity to the rural areas of Arkansas, I should like to take some credit for assisting to electrify rural Arkansas. A glance at the legislative record of 1937 within the State of Arkansas will reveal that BOYD TACKETT voted to bring rural electrification to the State of Arkansas when it was not nearly so popular as now. I have never yet failed to vote at every possible opportunity for rural electrification, and I shall

never vote against rural electrification. But I want to tell you who are hollering long and loud for public power to replace the rural electrification program and to allow the rural electrification system to be abolished by the greatest monopoly that was ever known to man, that you can talk about electric power monopolies all you like, but there is no greater or more drastic monopoly than a Government monopoly, and all of you know that. You public power advocates condemn monopolies on one hand while creating on the other hand the most dangerous monopoly known to man—a great Government monopoly.

When a boy on the farm, like my neighboring boyhood friends, I longed for the day when I could live in the small town nearby that I might enjoy some of the comforts and entitlements of life principally afforded by electric service. However, it is now possible to visualize a near future when the people of the metropolitan areas will be living for that day when it will be possible for them to move to and reside within the wide open rural spaces where they will at the same time be afforded equal comforts of life to those within the metropolitan areas.

Hamstring the rural electrification program? No. I would do absolutely nothing detrimental to this great enterprise and will always use every honorable means at my command to further this most meritorious project. I am a devout advocate of rural electrification, and I am just as anxious as any person in this country to see every farm within the United States electrified at the earliest possible date.

The REA and the SPA are distinct and separate programs, and the SPA has contributed nothing to advance or promote the high standards of rural electrification. The rural electrification program is a successful, meritorious, free, and independent organization—the respective electric cooperatives being owned, controlled, governed, and operated by and for the membership, with justifiable authority under our American way of life to freely engage in bringing electric service to the rural areas of our country.

The Southwestern Power Administration, on the other hand, is an agency of the Federal Government under the Department of the Interior with limited congressional authority to pool power and energy produced from Government multiple-purpose dams and distribute such power and energy as provided by law at rates to be approved by the Federal Power Commission.

I wholeheartedly concur in the statements of one of my fellow colleagues that rural electrification has been a long and hard struggle; that the remaining unserved 33 percent of rural Arkansas should be electrified under the splendid rural electrification program without delay; and that rural electrification is just now coming into full fruition. However, these facts do not in anywise justify the activities of the SPA. It cannot be contended that the SPA should be credited with having electrified 67 percent of the rural areas within the State of Arkansas, but, to the contrary, these

achievements have been realized under the authority granted by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. It is not necessary to allow the Department of the Interior, through the Southwestern Power Administration, to nationalize, federalize, and socialize the rural electric cooperatives in order to bring electricity to the remaining 33 percent of the unserved rural area of our State.

Yes; the rural electric cooperatives should be and are authorized and entitled to construct electric-generating units and transmission lines that the cheapest possible electric energy may be made available to the membership in accordance with good business principles under our system of free enterprise. However, I insist that the Southwestern Power Administration is not justifiably entitled to similar authorizations if we are to maintain our principles of democracy, assist our rural electrification program, and uphold our belief in private ownership.

To allow the Federal Government, through its SPA agency, to establish and dictate policies for the rural electric cooperatives, and to use, control, and receive all benefits from electric generating and transmission facilities constructed by the cooperatives is nothing less than an authorization to federalize the rural electric cooperatives, permit the SPA to expand its legal jurisdiction, and place the Government in direct competition with its citizens.

Those proposing to place the Government into the power field as a competitor in order to assure cheaper energy than the electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry can produce could just as successfully contend that we should have Government-owned parallel and duplicating railway and street-car tracks; airplane, boat, bus, and truck routes; telephone and telegraph lines; and radio and television channels. Petroleum, gas, and coal could be produced cheaper by the Government. No doubt all of these businesses are in the plans of those seeking to use the Government as a competitor to free enterprise. The ultimate results of such a plan can only mean Government operation and eventual ownership.

The rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest have today three sources of electricity:

First. Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own and operate themselves;

Second. Private power companies;

Third. Electric-generating plants that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves.

Right now the rural cooperatives have the private companies and the Federal Government SPA agency right where they should want them. Both are doing everything possible to do business with the cooperatives. The Southwestern Power Administration and the private companies are competing for the cooperatives' business, and they fully realize the possibility of the cooperatives' building their own steam-power units and trans-

mission lines should the electric rates not be sufficiently low to make justifiable such action on behalf of their membership. As long as this situation prevails it is the rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest that stand to benefit. They have their freedom of choice—the American way.

Once, however, these cooperatives lose their advantage by negotiating a long-term contract, permitting themselves to be tied irrevocably to the apron strings of the SPA for a period of 40 years, the opportunity to buy electricity upon a competitive market is gone and the right to produce and transmit electricity by means of their own facilities has vanished.

SPA is not in the power field with the rural cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry with my good graces. TVA was established not only for flood control and navigation but as a "yardstick" of electric costs for regulating private-power companies. The Public Service Commission in my State of Arkansas, as well as the Federal Power Commission, regulates the involved electric rates. The SPA must sell electricity from the Government flood-control dams at rates approved by the Federal Power Commission. The SPA renders only a power marketing service. The Corps of Engineers build and operate the flood-control dams, and could distribute the electricity from that source to the rural electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry over transmission lines built by the engineers, the private companies, or the cooperatives at a great savings to the taxpayers. Were the SPA completely out of the power field the rural electric cooperatives could still obtain electricity from the Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, the private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves. Alternative sources would come from private power companies or from electric-generating plants that the cooperatives build, own, operate themselves, and tie in with the Federal power projects.

If the rural electric cooperative membership throughout this country could in some manner be given the true picture of the situation at hand, it would take no action by Congress to preclude the federalization efforts now being made through the SPA plan. A great majority of the people are aware of the Federal Government gradually encroaching more and more upon the lives, happiness, and freedom of the American people. My people do not want Federal regimentation; they will not stand for it; and so long as I am a Member of Congress I shall do all in my power to keep it from being forced upon them.

I hold no brief for the private electric utilities; recognize them as monopolies requiring strict Federal regulation and supervision; but I feel that all water, telephone, electric, fuel, and like utilities have a definite place in our economic picture, and should not be permitted to be abolished by the competition of the Federal Government. No monopoly

could ever exist so dangerous and devastating to democracy as a Federal Government monopoly.

However, you may be assured that I do hold a brief, and a strong one, for the American system of free enterprise upon which this Nation was founded and has become the greatest upon the face of this earth. It alarms me and it should concern all of us tremendously when we see the Federal Government taking steps toward nationalization, which would result eventually in a completely socialized state. The founders of American democracy never intended that we employ such a system. The great strength of America today lies in the fact that our individuals and industries have been encouraged and inspired by the right of free enterprise—the right to earn a legitimate, honest dollar without working in direct competition with the Federal Government, or without being taken over, lock, stock, and barrel, by the Federal Government.

The Southwestern Power Administration activities are of far-reaching significance—going beyond the electric-power field—going into the very heart of our right for free enterprise which was guaranteed to each and every one of us by the pioneers who built our Nation and our Government. I, for one, want to preserve that right, and the future rights of our children to which they are justly entitled by American democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] never touched side, edge, or bottom of the real issue before us.

The power business is a public business. The water power of this Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

It was 17 years ago that we had this same fight on the floor of the House. They were trying to force us to turn the power generated in the Tennessee River over to the private power interests. If we had done that, and had turned the power on the Columbia River over to them, the average householder today would be paying from 15 to 25 cents a kilowatt-hour for his electricity, and the average farmer would not have seen an electric light in his home during this generation.

He criticizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. We have tried for years to develop the St. Lawrence to give them a yardstick which would probably save the people of New York State \$150,000,000 a year on their light and power bills.

The gentleman from Arkansas confuses the issue when he attempts to talk about private business being owned by the Government. Why, the clothing business is a private business, but the power business is a public business. Why? Because electricity has become a necessity of our modern life. It has to be handled by a monopoly and the water

power already belongs to the Federal Government. It is public power to begin with, and that applies to the energy generated by the Southwest Power Administration.

So we are dealing here with a public business. As the result of the battle that we have carried on for the last 17 years, we have managed to reduce power rates to the American people, while prices of everything else has been increasing. If it had not been for these yardsticks, such as the TVA, you would not only be paying the rate you are paying now in other areas, but you would be paying twice or three times as much. The American people would be paying from two to three, and probably four, billion dollars a year more for their electricity than they are now paying. In Arkansas they had 1.2 percent of their farms electrified before 1934. Today they have more than 70 percent. Where did it come from? It came through the REA. That is where it came from.

I remember the battle I had here in 1938 to secure the first \$100,000,000 for rural electrification. I just won by seven votes. If the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] had been here, I probably would have won by only six votes. That was when the REA really began to move forward.

Now, do not forget this: There are 33,000,000 residential power consumers in this country; people who turn on electric switches every day and every night. They are not willing to be robbed and plundered by the power trust in order to gratify the cupidity of a group of monopolists in Wall Street. There are 66,000,000 voters in this country that are not going to sit idly by, even in Arkansas or in Texas—they are not going to sit by and see this monopoly overcharge them with rates that are outrageously unreasonable.

Suppose you paid as much for electricity as you do for your telephone. The telephone trust has a complete monopoly. If you paid as much for electricity as you pay for your telephone, you would probably have not more than one light in each room—if that. I put a telephone in my office at home. I paid more for that telephone, even if I never picked up the receiver, than I paid for both gas and electricity in my home. I pay more for my telephone in Washington than I pay for both gas and electricity in my apartment. If it were not for these public-power systems, such as they have in Columbus, Ohio, Springfield, Ill., Lansing, Mich., and Austin, Tex., and these public-power systems that we have along these streams such as the Tennessee and the Columbia, to keep this monopoly from getting its hands on the water power of the Nation; if it were not for that you would be paying 15 to 25 cents per kilowatt-hour, and the average farmer in this country probably would not have seen electricity in his home for the next 40 years.

I have no apology to make to the gentleman from Arkansas, I have no apology to make to the Electric Bond & Share Co., and I have no apology to make to anyone else for my fight to see that

the American people get the benefit of the greatest wealth in America, outside of the soil upon which we live, that is the water power in our navigable streams and their tributaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, \$5,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 220, line 9, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,500,000."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, in the fiscal year 1950, we allowed \$4,000,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville power transmission system. Dr. Raver, the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, appeared before the committee to justify his 1951 request of \$5,250,000. While he was testifying he told the committee how well they had been able to operate and maintain the Bonneville power system with the \$4,000,000 which we had appropriated last year; and he said that everyone who was hired under this item had done a wonderful job. I asked Dr. Raver, then, if he did not think the Congress should have a little credit for holding the appropriation down to \$4,000,000. They had asked for considerably more, but the committee did not see fit to give it to them. Dr. Raver, in answer to my question, said: "Yes," that he thought the Congress should have some credit and that the committee should have some credit for holding this appropriation down to \$4,000,000; nevertheless, he asked for \$5,250,000 in this appropriation bill. The committee reduced that to \$5,000,000.

The purpose of my amendment is to reduce the amount further to \$4,500,000. It is true they have more responsibilities this year than last, but not to the extent of 25 percent. This will give them better than a 10-percent increase for operation and maintenance, and I think it is only fair and just that they be held down to \$4,500,000, for certainly we need to save a few million here and there in a lot of places.

The amendment is very reasonable and should be adopted by all means.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I invite the Committee's attention to the fact that the original estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget was \$5,250,000 for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration. Our subcommittee in its judgment saw fit to cut this item by a quarter of a million dollars, leaving the total amount available for operation and maintenance \$5,000,000.

I believe it is generally agreed that the Bonneville Power Administration, under the able direction of Dr. Paul Raver, is

one of the more efficient, if not the most efficient, of the agencies and bureaus within the Department of the Interior. That great organization has been operated in a businesslike manner. The Bonneville Power Administration will turn into the Treasury during the coming fiscal year approximately \$33,000,000 in revenue. During the current fiscal year, that is, fiscal 1950, the total expenditures that have been approved by the Congress for construction, operation, and maintenance, aggregate some \$46,000,000. For the coming fiscal year our subcommittee has approved the total sum of \$63,250,000, an increase of some \$22,000,000. We are engaged in a tremendous expansion program, and I believe the cut we have already made is more than adequate. Certainly it is not much of a reward to a great organization that is doing an efficient job to cripple it with a limitation of funds. As we expand the transmission lines, in keeping with the new dams that will be coming into operation, it is most essential that sufficient funds be provided to operate that great organization in an efficient manner.

I invite the Committee's attention to the fact that in 1952 the great McNary Dam will come into operation on the Columbia River, as well as the Hungry Horse project in northwestern Montana. This will add to the responsibilities of the Bonneville Power Administration. It is only a businesslike protection of the taxpayers' investment to expand the staff that will assume these added responsibilities.

I think the committee has done a prudent thing in trimming this expenditure somewhat. However, I do not think any further cut would be wise. I hope the Committee will vote the gentleman's amendment down.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as many of you gentlemen know, my district includes the Bonneville project on the Oregon side. I have had quite a bit to do with that undertaking while I have been a Member of Congress. I have served on the Public Works Committee which authorized all these various projects throughout the United States, including Bonneville.

With reference to this particular project, it must be conceded by those who are familiar with what is being done on the Columbia River that the Bonneville Administration through Dr. Raver is doing a good job. As a matter of fact, it is the one operation in the United States where Uncle Sam is getting back dollar for dollar all of the money he has put in by way of investment. The pay-out schedule on Bonneville is 10 years ahead of the program. In other words, if Bonneville continues this pay-out schedule it is making at the present time, the Federal Government will be paid back all of its investment 10 years ahead of the time originally prescribed for amortization.

The Bonneville Administration, as has been said and as admitted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], has increased responsibilities by reason of

the heavy increased development of hydroelectric power in that area. The State of Oregon has increased in population 59 percent in the last 10 years. It holds the lead in the United States of all States for percentage increase in population, which means that we have an increased demand for hydroelectric power and services of all sorts from public utilities. As a result, the Bonneville Power Administration has an increased burden. Every kilowatt of power that is produced at Bonneville is being sold at market price and those funds are going back into the Federal Treasury. As a result, it is not only paying out the Federal investment, but it is helping to build up the economy of the great Northwest where apparently so many of our people from other States want to make their permanent homes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I can understand why the gentleman opposes this amendment. I know he is greatly interested in the development of his State. The gentleman also knows that the Eightieth Congress treated the Bonneville Power Administration very generously. I was chairman of the committee that gave them more money than they ever had before in history. We do not want to stop that development. However, they had only \$4,000,000 last year, which is a lot of money for administration and operation. If my amendment is adopted, we will be giving them \$500,000 more this year than they had last year.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that I realize he has done an excellent job. He has been very kind, indeed, to Bonneville. While he served on this great committee he visited our area a number of times, he has gone over these projects, and is perhaps as well informed on them as any man who does not live in the area. But the fact is, we have increased responsibilities so far as Bonneville is concerned which requires more money for operation and maintenance in order to maintain the efficient service the agency is rendering the people of the Pacific Northwest. Many new generators are coming in. There is the Grand Coulee project, which has increased generating capacity. It will not be very long before the McNary Dam power will be brought in, then Hungry Horse, Albany Falls, and others. In the meantime Bonneville has to provide the transmission facilities to take care of this increased load. Every kilowatt-hour that is produced is being sold. We are not wasting a single kilowatt. As a matter of fact, we have gone 10 percent plus above the rated generating capacity of those projects to supply needed power, and even then we are not able to supply the hydroelectricity to the industries and the farmers that need the power in the area. There is a great dearth of power in the area. The committee already has cut \$250,000 below the budget estimate. If we cut the item an additional \$500,000, as this amendment will do, it means that you

are just going to curtail the activities of one great agency of this Federal Government, among the few, which is paying its way and doing a good job in serving a fast-growing area. I think it would be a grave mistake, and I think the gentleman from Iowa himself will realize, after the years have gone by, that it will be a mistake if we curtail these activities of this efficient Federal agency.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I think it is opportune here to express the point that the Hanford Engineering Works is in the Pacific Northwest, in the central part of the State of Washington, which, in turn, is consuming a tremendous amount of power from the services of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman's observation is true. If it were not for the Bonneville Power Administration, that great atomic energy undertaking at Hanford in Washington could not be carried forward. It has performed an outstanding service in our national defense program.

It seems that not a year can pass without some sort of an attack being made on the Bonneville Power Administration. This year, as in many years past, the attack is on their appropriations requests, which, of course, is the most vulnerable spot of any Federal agency. It does not seem to make any difference that the management of this agency has constantly demonstrated that their operations are on a par with the best private operations in the country, that they not only meet but exceed statutory requirements as regards pay-out, or that the Administrator is fully aware of the wise use of the money appropriated to him. No; no matter what degree of efficiency is demonstrated by this agency, they can still expect to be attacked whenever they ask for appropriations to carry on the duties imposed upon them by law. This year the attack is centered on appropriations for operation and maintenance. It is the most vulnerable spot of any type of enterprise, public or private.

It is in this part of the Bonneville activity where the most stringent requirements have always been imposed by Congress and which has caused the most difficulty to the Bonneville Administrator.

Funds for operation and maintenance for the Bonneville Power Administration have been annually set up in the appropriation bill as a limitation within the total funds appropriated. Congress, in its wisdom, feels that such limitations are necessary in order to control the activities of the Federal power agencies. Personally, I am not in sympathy with that view. The record of the Bonneville Power Administration over the past 10 years indicates that its management is certainly of the highest order. You do not have to take my word for it—a copy of Bonneville's annual report can be made available to you upon request. That report will show you that over the

period of its operations to date, this agency has not only met all repayment requirements as set up by law, but shows a comfortable surplus of nearly \$43,000,000 more than the cash appropriation requested this year for capital expenditure. And remember that this financial picture has been compiled from power revenues based on the lowest wholesale power rates in this country. When an Administrator can show such a record, I do not think he needs to be told how far he can be permitted to go in expending funds for any given operation or activity. He knows that if his overhead is too great, he is not going to pay out. He has demonstrated that he knows this important fact, so why hamstring him by limitations that can have no other result except that of forced inefficiency.

I know that at times the Bonneville Administrator has been at his wit's end in trying to determine how to handle the various necessary activities that must be performed in an operation of the magnitude of that encompassed by the Bonneville Power Administration. A few statistics will very quickly indicate why this is so.

I do not intend to burden this body with a long recital of these statistics, but will indicate some figures for 2 years, showing comparisons of Bonneville operations with private operations. In the general debate on this chapter last Friday I discussed Bonneville operations at some length. In 1947, operating expenses of the Bonneville Power Administration were 11.4 percent of operating revenues. A comparable figure for all of the combined class A and B utilities in the United States for that year is 21.8 percent. Also in that year, the operating utilities in the Pacific Northwest used from 18.2 percent to 31.4 percent of their operating revenues for operating expenses and this range covers all of the utilities operating in that area. Let me put this matter on another base. Operating expenses on a basis of mills per kilowatt-hour sold were 0.32 for Bonneville, 3.50 for the combined class A and B utilities in this country, and the range for the Pacific Northwest utilities was 1.3 to 4.11.

Now let us go to 1948. In that year, the operating expenses as a percent of operating revenues were 13.2 percent for Bonneville, 21.4 percent for the combined A and B utilities, and a range of 20.9 percent to 29.2 percent for the Pacific Northwest utilities. On the basis of mills per kilowatt-hour sold, Bonneville's cost was 0.31, the combined A and B utilities 3.55, and the range for the Pacific Northwest utilities 1.54 to 5.66. In all of the foregoing figures, production expenses have been deducted in order to make the figures comparable, since in the private operations production expenses are a very large part of their operating cost.

I would like to cite one other comparison. In 1947, Bonneville's operating expenses as a percent of total electric plant were 3.4 percent as against 14.4 percent for the combined class A and B utilities. In 1948, the comparison was 3.3 percent for Bonneville, and 15.3 percent for the combined A and B utilities. In 1949, Bonneville's percent is still 3.3

percent, but I do not have a comparable figure for the combined A and B utilities.

My colleagues, do you need any further demonstration of the effectiveness of Bonneville's operations? Do you need any further evidence that they have been forced to do a job with lesser tools than any private operation requires, or are you willing to admit that the Bonneville Power Administration operations are far more efficient than the best private operations in this country? It is my opinion that it is a combination of the two. You have not allowed this agency sufficient funds to properly operate and maintain their system, and the fact that they have gotten along as well as they have with the funds available certainly is a tribute to the efficiency of their operations.

There is a saying that one can be penny-wise and pound-foolish. If you gentlemen are sincere in your statements that you want to save money for this country, then you certainly do not want to be accused of being penny-wise and pound-foolish; but I can assure you that that is what you will be if you continue to curtail operation money for this agency. At least, let us be fair and put them on a par with private enterprise, of which we have heard so much in recent years.

I did not intend to burden you with any further statistics, but I will make another comparison which I think is very pertinent. This pertains to administrative and general expenses. In 1947 cost in this category for Bonneville as a percent of operating revenues was 4 percent. For the combined class A and B utilities it was 6.5 percent. For the Pacific Northwest systems it varied from 6 to 9.5 percent. Comparable figures for 1948 are 5 percent for Bonneville, 6.3 percent for the combined A and B utilities, and a range of 6.2 to 9.1 percent for the Pacific Northwest utilities. In 1949 this figure remained at 5 percent for Bonneville. I do not have a comparable figure for the other utilities for that year.

It is my considered opinion that we do not need to impose any type of limitation for operation and maintenance for the Bonneville Power Administration. They have demonstrated that they can do more with a dollar than most private operations in this country. The Bonneville people are proud of their record, and I am absolutely certain that they do not intend to jeopardize that record by any ill-considered use of funds. However, there is such a limitation. There is a specific appropriation for operation and maintenance. If we must have it, then let us make it high enough to permit the Bonneville Administrator to do the job in the way that it should be done. The amount of \$5,000,000 that is in this appropriation for operation and maintenance for this agency will still not bring them up to the comparable expenditure by private utilities, so I ask you to let that figure stand without any further reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be voted down so that the operations of the Bonneville Administration may not be curtailed and service to the fast-growing area in the Pacific Northwest be set back. Such a course will penalize the residents of the area.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I wish the Members on both sides of the aisle would realize and that is this, that we are not giving the Bonneville Power Administration a dime; we are not giving any of these agencies a quarter. They are going to pay back this money. Now, if you want them to go ahead and construct Bonneville and everything else out of the Northwest, as well as the rest of the power projects in this bill, you should realize that we are not giving any one of them a dime. Sixty-one percent of this money is coming back. They are going to pay it back; in fact, that is one branch of the Government, one department, that pays back. There is a little over \$100,000,000 in this bill to operate other parts of the Department of the Interior—surveys and matters like that.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member in the House who has made a more diligent and determined fight for economy in the Congress of the United States than my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the proposer of this amendment.

I recognize it is necessary to bring economy to the Government if our Nation is to remain solvent. I honor the gentleman from Iowa for making his fight for economy. I usually support him. At the same time, I think we must be selective in reducing Government expenses, for merely cutting an item may prove false economy rather than wise. There is such a thing as being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The Bonneville Power Authority operates a great and growing business. Last year it did a business of \$27,881,000, sold that much power and electricity. During the coming year Dr. Raver, the administrator, estimates Bonneville power sales will total \$32,231,000. In other words, the Bonneville Power Administration will increase its electricity sales by more than \$4,000,000 or by more than 15 percent.

Due to this about 15 percent expansion in Bonneville power sales more lines and substations must be operated. This will require more people to supervise its power distribution and more persons and materials to keep its lines in repair and in efficient operation.

Also as these lines and substations grow older they require more repairs and greater sums must be spent on their maintenance. Every businessman knows it usually is cheaper to maintain a machine in good condition than to repair one. To allow machines or power lines to deteriorate is, in my opinion, false economy. We may, if this amendment

carries, save \$500,000 this year, but in future years may, as a result of this attempted saving, be confronted with much larger and more costs in repairs.

Our industrial situation in the Pacific Northwest, by which I mean the States of Oregon and Washington, is rather unusual. We have very little coal. We have no gas and no oil. We are almost solely dependent on hydroelectricity to operate the multitude of machines in our many and varied industries. If our power supply were broken by a transmission line break or a substation closure we have no easy or ready way of restoring the means of driving the machines in our industries. Such breakdowns mean tremendous losses in employment to workers and large extra costs to manufacturers as well as a loss of income-tax revenues to the Government.

Power is of no value unless it is delivered to the places of consumption, and delivered there in abundance and uninterruptedly. Reduction of the item of \$5,000,000, provided in the bill for operation and maintenance of the Bonneville Power Administration, to \$4,507,000 as is proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is, in my opinion, not wise. I hope his amendment will be rejected. This item has already been reduced below the Budget Bureau's recommendation by \$250,000 in committee. I believe it is poor economy to reduce it any further.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. As a matter of fact, when you boil the whole situation down, you have the power installations that produce the current. What you need this money for is to extend your lines and sell your electricity when it comes from these power-producing plants.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Power is of no value, of course, unless it is delivered to the ultimate consumer, and delivered in an uninterrupted manner.

Mr. JENNINGS. Over a line of wire strung on poles.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Let us keep the record straight. This does not take anything away from the construction.

Mr. MACK of Washington. No; that is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. It takes nothing away from the building of lines or related facilities. It simply reduces by 10 percent the amount to be spent for administration and operation. The facts are that they need no sales force because they have more demand for the power than they have power. We are giving them more for the year that starts July 1 than we did for this year, the fiscal year 1950, by the amount of \$500,000.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Yes; but the lines will carry 10 or 15 percent more current than it has in former years. Bonneville will be a bigger business and naturally the bigger the business the more money needed to operate it.

Mr. JENSEN. That does not make so much difference. You do not have to follow that current along the wire. It gets there without your pushing it along too much.

Mr. MACK of Washington. There are also more substations to maintain and operate.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. It is true, is it not, that the reduction in this allowance will take away money which is provided for the maintenance of these lines which are now carrying heavier loads than they should be required to carry? Last year they had two or three breakdowns due to the overloading of the lines. It threw out of operation many of the industries, practically, in that area. There is an additional expense in the maintenance of the transmission lines. It is true there is no money in this for construction purposes. It is maintenance.

Mr. MACK of Washington. As the lines get older they also require more maintenance.

Mr. ANGELL. That is true.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Along the line of what the gentleman from Oregon has said, I would remind the House that we had a very, very severe winter last year, and that always has its effect upon the items that have to be maintained in any transmission lines. That is a factor that should be taken into consideration at this time.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 57, noes 78.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENSEN and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 74, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed 17 of which 12 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed two) of aircraft; and printing and binding. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 220, after line 21, add the following new paragraph:

"Not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds herein provided for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for travel expenses."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NORRELL. I desire to offer an amendment to amend the force account on page 220, line 21, by inserting a new paragraph. If the gentleman's amendment is considered before my amendment, will my amendment be out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] seeks to add a new paragraph.

Mr. NORRELL. My amendment will be in order after his amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not seen the gentleman's amendment but would assume it would be offered after the pending amendment is disposed of. The gentleman may offer his amendment after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I ask unanimous consent to revise the remarks I previously made in Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to reduce the travel item which of course does not appear in the bill, but the information we have been able to obtain from the Department is to the effect that there is \$1,564,175 requested in this bill for travel for the Bonneville Power Administration. The amendment which I have offered reduces that figure to \$1,000,000. The business of the Bonneville Power Administration is mostly within the States of Washington and Oregon. It is difficult to understand how they can even spend \$1,000,000 for travel. Of course, we realize there are some officials of the Bonneville Power Administration who must come to Washington occasionally, especially to testify before the House and Senate, but certainly there is no reason for allowing more than \$1,000,000. We do know that many of the higher officials of the Bonneville Power Administration do travel all over the country making speeches to every kind of organization you could imagine. It is not their business to do that.

The business of the officials of the Bonneville Power Administration is to look after the business of the Bonneville Power Administration and not to run all over this United States and Europe telling the people of America and of the world the virtues of the Bonneville Power Administration.

That is about all there is to it, Mr. Chairman; it is a very modest cut, considering the amount we should allow for such travel expenses, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman and shall, of course, support his amendment. I note that in this paragraph there is no reference at all to travel, whereas in other sections of the bill we have had specific authority for travel. I wonder if the gentleman would explain why there is not anything under that item in this paragraph?

Mr. JENSEN. I might answer the gentleman by referring him to the criticism of the Interior Department by the chairman of the committee in the report, criticism for the method they used in coming before the committee to justify their appropriations and for many other things that are going on in the Department of the Interior which is not pleasing to any of the members of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations. So, when the gentleman asks me why certain things in this item did not appear in the bill, the facts are there are just a lot of things that do not appear in this bill because they were not willing to give us the facts that we should have had in order to write a bill and in order to appropriate properly.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, this portion of the bill was written, in substance, down in the Interior Department; is that what I am to understand?

Mr. JENSEN. No; I would not say that; I would say that with the information the committee had the chairman wrote this report and this bill. We did not have enough information to write a bill that could be very specific, as it should have been.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the committee's attention the fact that the reason the word "travel" does not appear in the item is because it is contained in the basic Bonneville Act. As I understand it, the words "travel allowance" are included in the appropriation bill only where there is no basic authority for travel allowance. The allowance for this year is \$1,345,024. As the gentleman from Iowa has pointed out, such travel funds for fiscal 1951 will be \$1,564,175. This item was broken down and presented to our subcommittee in connection with the justification. Again, I should like to call to the attention of the committee the fact that there are certain increases that apply to travel generally in all of these items that are being presented this year. As the gentleman knows, last year the House ap-

proved the increased per diem allowance from \$6 a day to \$9. In addition there have been increases in fares. I invite attention to the fact also that the area now covered by the Bonneville Power Administration is expanding very materially. In the pending bill there is a substantial increase for new transmission lines into southern Oregon. Lines are also running from the State of Washington through Idaho over to the Hungry Horse Dam; in other words, this item, I think, is pretty much in keeping with the necessary expenses of this great agency. As I pointed out in my previous statement in connection with the operation and maintenance expenses, the Bonneville Power Administration has done an outstanding and efficient job and it has operated its agency in a businesslike manner.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. Will the gentleman tell the Committee with respect to the auditing of these accounts and whether there has been any criticism of the manner in which they kept their books and accounts?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This is the first time I have heard of that.

Mr. REES. I am talking about the Department of the Interior in general.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There may be some other bureau subject to criticism, but speaking with specific reference to the Bonneville Power Administration I may say that it has been commended for the businesslike way in which it has kept its accounts.

In that connection I call attention to the fact that the Bonneville Power Administration was audited by Arthur Anderson & Co., one of the leading certified public accounting firms in the country and that organization gave it a very clean bill of health. That is a private auditing firm. In addition to that, it is my understanding there has never been any criticism, at least to my knowledge, by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. REES. That may be true with respect to the Bonneville Power Administration, but I have heard some criticism with respect to the manner in which it has kept their books and their accounts and that the General Accounting Office is attempting to work out a system so that we will have some understanding with respect to the manner in which these funds are expended.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman understands I am directing my statements to a specific amendment that is pending.

Mr. REES. I appreciate that, but I thought the gentleman could enlighten us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to corroborate what the gentleman from Washington says to the effect that the books of the Bonneville Power Administration have been audited by this eastern firm

and I think the Bonneville Power Administration is to be commended for its good work in this respect.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I quite agree with the gentleman. It is the first time that a firm of national reputation has been called in to audit the books.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. May I say to the gentleman from Washington that the whole item of travel of our Federal employees should be investigated. I have no doubt but what this would be a fertile field for examination. However, I do object to the amendment on the basis that I would rather see it departmental-wide, rather than picking on one particular part of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, each subcommittee has the responsibility of reducing or adding to the budget requests. I have no particular inside knowledge of items in other subcommittee hearings, but in this instance we have heard all the testimony. We know the problem, we know the situation and certainly anyone who knows the conditions as exist would have to agree that a million dollars is more than the Bonneville Power Administration should have for travel.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 43, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: Page 220, after line 21, insert "not to exceed 12 percent of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired labor basis except in cases of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, this only restores existing law; it adds nothing to it. For many years there has been a limitation on the amount of construction money that the Bonneville Power Administration could use itself and thereby not contract out to private enterprise. This merely puts back into the law, which was, I think, inadvertently omitted by the committee, the existing law, and I think there will be no objection to it.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time briefly to propound an inquiry of the members of the committee. I have been advised and have observed that through either design or inadvertence the funds available for the Oil and Gas Division for the Director and his staff, Department of the Interior, have been practically deleted. The purpose of my taking this time is to inquire of the committee if it was really the intention of the committee in the consideration of this measure to do away with this division which has been in effect an operation and serving the people over a long period of time. If some member of the committee could answer that, I would appreciate it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. In reply to the gentleman from Arkansas I can state that in the first place this specific activity is not authorized by law. The committee has in effect delegated to the Secretary the authority to expend funds in this area. The committee felt that discretion should be vested in the Secretary of the Interior to let him determine whether or not the expenditure should be made. The funds are made available but the mandatory expenditure of the funds is not required.

Mr. HARRIS. I am advised by the Secretary's office that they are very much in need of this. This is a very vital part of their service. It is rendering a very fine service to the people of the country, and it is badly needed, because without it they are very much at the mercy of certain of the industries who get themselves in a position with cooperative arrangements.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. If the gentleman will refer to page 160 of the report accompanying the omnibus bill he will find the committee has stated the following:

It is noted that the Oil and Gas Division was established after the war to continue certain functions performed by the Petroleum Administration for War. There was a need to have active Government cooperation with the petroleum industry during the period of maldistribution of oil products just after the war, but the committee is cognizant of no such condition or need at present. Therefore, the Oil and Gas Division should be either abolished or substantially reduced. Specialists in the petroleum field can be made a part of the program organization to advise the Secretary on policy and coordination of those matters for which the Department is responsible by law.

May I state as a follow-up that the committee has not taken away the funds for that particular activity. The committee has in effect suggested that this ought to be coordinated and tied in with the work of the Secretary.

Mr. HARRIS. I respectfully submit to the gentleman that this is a very worthy function of the Government. The need for it now seems to be much more apparent than it was even during the war or immediately after the war. The Secretary has only recently submitted to the National Petroleum Council the request to make certain investigations and to

report thereon, on the vitally important subject of the importation of crude oil.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The money has not been taken away from the Secretary.

Mr. HARRIS. The Secretary says different; \$148,000, either indirectly or directly.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. My understanding of legislative procedure is that what I am saying here is making a part of the legislative history of this item. It may be that the Department will want to use this money for some other activity, but that is not the fault of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand that is not altogether the case, as it is understood by the Department. The Secretary himself has so said, as I understand.

May I ask the gentleman if his committee will, then, as the appropriation bill takes its way through this Congress, if it develops later on through the information that he obtains from the Secretary of the Interior that there is a need for this, give consideration to providing him just such funds as are absolutely needed.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. May I suggest to my friend from Arkansas that the appropriate way to approach this problem is the regular way, that is, to introduce legislation to authorize this activity.

Mr. HARRIS. This matter is authorized, and the Department of the Interior has set it up under Executive order of the President of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I regret to differ with my friend. It is not authorized by law. It would be subject to a point of order if specifically provided for in this bill. The gentleman is much better off from his own standpoint that it is not included as a separate item. If it were, it would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. I would suggest that the gentleman look into it a little further in the course of the appropriation bill going through. If it does appear that it is needed, as the bill goes through the other body and then into conference, the gentleman will find that he can perform a very worth-while service.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I think the colloquy that has taken place here provides the basis for a solution to the gentleman's problem.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$6,756,800: *Provided*, That this appropriation may be expended on a reimbursable basis for surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, although I am not going to offer any amendment to increase the appropriation for the Bureau of Land

Management, I feel that our committee in this instance has cut a little too deep.

When we review the committee report in relation to the original President's budget, and the bill as reported out, we find certain items that have been cut too closely for the people's good.

The wise administering of the public lands is important to the whole country, not only from the standpoint of food production, but from that of revenue producing activities such as oil, potassium and other minerals that are developed through private leasing of these lands, timber production and conservation, grazing and selective disposal of lands under the various land laws.

The agency responsible for the management of the lands is the Bureau of Land Management which has been seriously cut in several major activities of its appropriation.

This agency may be likened to a business—it takes money for it to make money. On its limited appropriations it has been turning in Federal revenues amounting to more than \$37,000,000, in other words approximately \$7 return for every \$1 appropriated. But with greatly increased business it needs more help to carry the load. Actually the number of employees has decreased since 1940. It occurred to me that the subcommittee may have lost sight of the above important aspect of the Bureau's work. In our effort to reduce Government expenditure we must not confuse gross expenditures with net expenditures.

Actually this agency has done a good job of increasing efficiency in the last 2 years, more than trebling the output per man. The small number of personnel cannot possibly keep speeding up the job to keep pace with the increasing volume of business. In my own State, Mr. Paul Roach, a land office manager, died in office as a result of overwork.

There must also be additional funds for development of resource programs that are vital to other conservation jobs. I am speaking specifically of the Bureau's need to provide protection of the watersheds on the public domain lands. In the Rio Grande area of my own State this is especially serious. Siltation of lands from neglected watershed areas is a threat to our very livelihood. The public lands contribute much of the silt flowing into Elephant Butte Reservoir. This is rapidly making useless a great reservoir, upon which our irrigation agriculture is based. Siltation also is filling the river channel, necessitating large public investments in flood-control structures. It is not economy to curtail work for watershed management and improvement, neglecting causes of trouble and spreading all our money—millions of dollars—on relief to the distressed situations caused by it.

I sincerely hope that before the bill returns to the House an adjustment may be made, and I strongly urge that the committee will yield in those cases where the appropriation of added funds will actually in effect decrease the net spending through the added revenues returned, and when the final analysis is made that sufficient funds to do at least the mini-

mum essential management job will be appropriated for the Bureau of Land Management.

The Clerk read as follows:

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

The aggregate of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, as range-improvement fees under the provisions of section 3 of the act of June 28, 1934 (43 U. S. C. 315), and 25 percent of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, under the provisions of section 15 of said act (in addition to all moneys received during the fiscal year 1950 from either of such sources but not yet appropriated), shall be available until expended for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of said act.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph appearing on page 222, lines 18 through 25, and page 223, lines 1 through 3, which is as follows:

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

The aggregate of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, as range-improvement fees under the provisions of section 3 of the Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U. S. C. 315) and 25 percent of all moneys received after June 30, 1950, under the provisions of section 15 of said Act (in addition to all moneys received during the fiscal year 1950 from either of such sources but not yet appropriated), shall be available until expended for construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of said Act.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Iowa intends to make points of order to subsequent items relating to the same subject matter, namely, the Bureau of Land Management. Would it be in order for the gentleman from Iowa to submit the various points of order dealing with the same subject matter and that they be considered in bloc; and also, is it in order for me to offer an amendment which will make the appropriations on an annual basis in lieu of the language to be stricken on the points of order?

The CHAIRMAN. That can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have the following points of order to make.

I make a point of order against the language on page 223, lines 4 through 12, which language is as follows:

PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

Five percent of the net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials from public lands received after June 30, 1950 (in addition to 5 percent of all moneys received prior to June 30, 1950, as net proceeds of sales of public lands and materials from public lands but not yet appropriated), shall be available for payment to the States in which such lands are situated for the purpose of education or of making public roads and improvements.

I make a point of order against the language on page 223, lines 13 through 24, which language is as follows:

PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA

Thirty-seven and one-half percent of the royalties received after June 30, 1950 (in addition to 37½ percent of all royalties re-

ceived during the fiscal year 1950 but not yet appropriated), from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), shall be available for payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal funds accruing under said act, to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191).

I make a point of order against the language on page 224, line 1 through 8, which language is as follows:

LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

The aggregate of all moneys received after June 30, 1950 (in addition to all moneys received during the fiscal year 1950 but not yet appropriated), from grazing fees for State, county, or privately owned lands leased in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), shall be available until expended for leasing of such lands.

I make a point of order against the language on page 224, lines 9 through 16, which language is as follows:

PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

Thirty-three and one-third percent of all grazing fees received after June 30, 1950, from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-lands laws, shall be available for payment to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the act of June 23, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j).

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language I have indicated, in each instance, has the effect of making appropriations on a permanent basis, which goes beyond the scope of the bill and also constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, is not in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the points of order made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 222, after line 17 insert the following:

"RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

"For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the act of June 23, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received as range improvement fees under section 3 of said act and of 25 percent of all moneys received under section 15 of said act during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated, to remain available until expended.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES (PROCEEDS OF SALES)

"For payment to the several States of 5 percent of the net proceeds of sales of public lands lying within their limits, for the purpose of education or of making public roads and improvements, sums equal to the aggregate of receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the act of June 26, 1934 (31 U. S. C. 725c), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

"PAYMENT TO OKLAHOMA

"For payment to the State of Oklahoma in lieu of all State and local taxes upon tribal

funds accruing under the provisions of the joint resolution of June 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 740), to be expended by the State in the same manner as if received under section 35 of the act approved February 25, 1920 (30 U. S. C. 191), sums equal to 37½ percent of the royalties received during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from the south half of Red River in Oklahoma under the provisions of said joint resolution of June 12, 1926.

"LEASING OF GRAZING LANDS

"For leasing State, county, or privately owned lands in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-1), sums equal to the aggregate of receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with the act of June 23, 1938 (43 U. S. C. 315m-4), during the current and prior fiscal years but not yet appropriated.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES (GRAZING FEES)

"Sums not in excess of 33½ percent of all grazing fees received during the current and prior fiscal years (but not yet appropriated) from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States for disposition under the public-land laws, to be paid to the State in which said lands are situated, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of the act of June 23, 1934, as amended (43 U. S. C. 315j)."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. JENSEN. Reserving the right to object, this simply reasserts existing language?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This has the effect of placing these items on an annual basis, instead of on a permanent basis, and there is no other change.

Mr. TABER. It is the same language that was used last year?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Whether it is exactly the same language, I cannot say for sure, but the effect is to carry it as heretofore; that is, on an annual basis. That is the only change. The net effect is to continue it as heretofore. There is no change in the substance.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand that in the amendment the gentleman has just offered there is no additional authority given to any officer of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. In reading the last paragraph, I understood the Clerk to read "33½." I understand the previous language was "33½."

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the "33½" be changed to read "33¼."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. May I inquire of the gentleman from Washington—I have already propounded the question once, and I did not get a satisfactory answer—in the language which is proposed now, there is some new language which is not in the fiscal 1950 bill? Is that a fact?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. To be completely frank and honest with the gentleman, I have not compared the language with the 1950 bill, but I want to assure the gentleman that the purpose of offering this is not to change the substance in any way of the language heretofore carried in the 1950 bill. Of necessity we have relied on our technicians to prepare this in keeping with the general coverage of the 1950 appropriation bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Was this change of language which the gentleman has just submitted written by the Department of the Interior or by our own staff?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. This was prepared by our own committee clerk.

Mr. JENSEN. I have no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. This is not entirely familiar to me and I should like to ask the gentleman what would happen if we did not adopt the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. As I understand, there is substantive law which provides that these receipts shall go into specific funds in the Treasury, that under the basic law heretofore passed by the Congress certain people are entitled to these receipts. I have offered these amendments simply in order to accommodate the point of order offered by the gentleman from Iowa. They introduce no new substance into the bill. Therefore, nothing will be accomplished by a failure to adopt these amendments. In fact, it will simply confuse the situation. There will be no savings by not agreeing to the amendments which we are offering in lieu of the matter stricken by the points of order.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, to put it another way, if we did not adopt the amendments offered by the gentleman from Washington, it would not result in these sums being gathered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Oh, no. It is my understanding that they are primarily funds allocated for a specific purpose and they do not go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. They would not go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury if the amendment that I have offered in lieu of the language stricken out on the point of order were voted down.

Mr. KEATING. And that is because of legislation heretofore enacted.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DEWART. I wish to say that these amendments carry out the purpose of the Nicholson report, which was the result of a study under the direction of the President relating to the management and handling of public land. That report was made 2 or 3 years ago to the Secretary of the Interior. It contains certain recommendations in regard to the disposition of funds and the management of public lands, and these provisions in this bill carry out those recommendations of the so-called Nicholson report.

Mr. Chairman, we are at this time taking a second look at the Appropriations Committee report. Before we put the final seal of approval upon it, we must be sure that in our attempt to place the accent on economy, we have not actually increased the net Government expense through the curtailment of money making and money saving activities.

Certain items of this nature are found in the program of the Bureau of Land Management, a program with which I am especially familiar. The items for land classification, for grazing administration and for range and watershed improvement are of great importance to the West as well as to potential users of the public domain wherever they may reside.

Land classification activities have made possible a realistic program for land use and land rehabilitation of abused public lands. Classification enables the Bureau to dispose of those isolated tracts of Federal land where productive management is not practical. It discloses areas where erosion may cause excessive siltation of water storage facilities, an extremely important consideration at this time when we are spending so much money for the construction of multipurpose dams and reservoirs on western rivers. All of this work, which saves money and reduces the cost of government, should be continued with adequate land classification personnel.

The committee has made reductions in the request for Grazing Administration, an item which I feel should be restored both in the interests of proper administration of the public domain and in the interests of the users of this land. This item is necessary to carry out the full program of the Taylor Grazing Act, which includes, as you will recall, five principal purposes: First, to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; second, to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; third, to effect an equitable apportionment of the grazing privileges among the owners of base properties outside of the districts and to issue grazing licenses, permits or leases in accordance with these determinations; fourth, to provide adequate supervision in order to insure proper use and to prevent trespass use; and fifth, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range.

The public domain is a great resource, of tremendous value to all the people of our Nation. It is an essential part of our economy in the West. It is in the interests of all of us that it be properly managed, maintained, and used to the fullest

advantage, and the comparatively small sums required to achieve these purposes are money well spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this administration may well be proud of the job it conceives in the field of management—a job which the President's budget fully reflected this year. Many cuts have been made in this budget where there was evidence that these cuts could be made without danger to the Nation's economy.

At the same time the President's budget recommended increases in appropriations to a few agencies whose essential workload had increased greatly and whose operating load had demonstrated that they had wisely managed the funds allotted to them. An outstanding example is the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior. This agency, as you know, is responsible for the management of the public domain lands. The workload of this agency through applications of individuals, small businessmen, and large industrialists has more than doubled, yet the number of persons available to handle these applications has decreased. The Bureau has cut corners in administration to the point that they have trebled the output per worker in the past 2 years. Still the individuals and businesses wanting to develop and use the public lands pour in with applications. With increased appropriations it had hoped to permit an even better program for use of the public domain. Curtailment of funds from the President's budget will slow down the work and cause a terrific load to be placed on the Bureau of Land Management's meager staff.

In my own State of California I have observed the job land office personnel are doing. They are carrying too heavy a load and that load is increasing as applications for public land use increase. The item of \$884,210 in contrast to the requested amount of \$1,119,600 provides only for present operation in leasing and disposal of lands and mineral resources. In California and other States the Bureau of Land Management has received thousands of applications from disabled and other veterans of World War II for desert homesites. These applications cannot be handled promptly in spite of the recognized personal urgency of such cases without added appropriations.

Increased appropriations to the land management functions of the Bureau of Land Management will actually result in a net decrease in Federal costs, since last year this agency collected \$7 for every \$1 spent. Added funds will, similarly, more than pay for themselves.

In my considered judgment, the original estimate of \$9,750,000 in the President's budget for the Bureau of Land Management is an amount well justified on the basis of returns. Furthermore, Bureau officials have demonstrated that they know how to spend the Government

money appropriated with the same care that would be exercised if it were their own.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the Record where debate was concluded on the point of order first offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], which was subsequently withdrawn, and on which the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] spoke.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SERVICES

For expenses, necessary to provide health, education, and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission) of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of Indians participating in folk festivals; \$37,929,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have just approved the item in the appropriation bill which provides funds for the general activities and services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

In this connection, I wish to point out the need for an improvement in the administration of law and order on the average Indian reservation and particularly on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota.

I am told that so bad have conditions become that very few residents, white or Indian, within the boundaries of the reservation, feel safe to go out at night and particularly to attend dances or other social gatherings after dark.

There has been a complete breakdown of police protection. Within the past few years, several murders have been committed without charges being filed against suspects, much less convictions.

Delegations have appealed to the Governor of the State, but dispatch of representatives from the State justice department have been met by the statement that they lack jurisdiction on Indian lands. Now a movement is under way to create a sort of vigilantes organization among the people for their own protection.

The situation seems to be the result in part of trying to turn the problem of law and order over to the so-called law and order set-up under the Indian reorganization act and in part the result of inadequate appropriations or improper allocation of funds.

Whatever the cause, the situation merits a definite investigation by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and although I have previously discussed it with officials

of the Bureau, I wish to make it a matter of public record in connection with the passage of these appropriations.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended, \$21,922,000, of which not to exceed \$3,737,500 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted; and, in addition, the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$1,500,000.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ:

On page 225, line 24, strike out "\$21,922,000" and insert "\$22,422,000."

On page 226, line 5, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in this appropriation bill our committee has cut down items affecting New Mexico, but I am not going to quarrel with the judgment of the committee as to those items with the exception of this particular one for the reason I believe that our committee in striking out the item which I attempt to restore by my amendment committed a very grievous error.

In order that we may get the full facts before the committee, let me give the committee a short history of this situation. The purpose of my amendment is to restore \$1,500,000 authorized last fall by an act passed by the Congress for the construction of an Indian and non-Indian hospital, a cooperative hospital to be used by Indians and non-Indians, in Bernalillo County.

The county of Bernalillo, of which the city of Albuquerque comprises about 90 percent, 2 years ago floated bonds to build its own little hospital, and after it had floated these bonds, Mr. Hageberg and Mr. Brophy, two of the finest men employed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, went to the county commissioners and said, "We need a hospital for the Indians, and we are going to have to ask the Federal Government for an appropriation to build such a hospital. Why do we not join hands and build a joint hospital for both the use of the Indians and the use of the non-Indians?" After several weeks of negotiations they finally came to an agreement. This agreement was put into the form of a bill which was introduced by the New Mexico delegation and it was approved unanimously. It passed the House and the Senate and went to the President for his signature. The President in signing the bill took the very

unusual step in commending it in these words:

I wish to express my full approval of the basic objective of this legislation which is to encourage the integration of hospital facilities for the care of Indians and non-Indians in the same community.

The bill was approved by the President and the Bureau of the Budget approved the item of \$1,500,000; \$500,000 in cash and \$1,000,000 in contract authorizations. When it came to the committee, some of the members of the committee, particularly the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], felt the same way about the excellent policy established by such a law. But, when it came to marking up the bill, there was some concern about the exact wording of the law and because of a misunderstanding, I am sure, the appropriation was disallowed.

The misunderstanding came about because of some of the language in the bill. The bill provided that for this \$1,500,000, 100 beds be made available at all times to the Indians. It provided that the Federal Government pay for 80 percent of those beds made available to the Indians and the State would then have to carry the other 20 percent free of charge. It also provided that whenever it was thought necessary by the commissioners, the number of beds set aside for the Indians may be reduced, and that that may be done if in return the operator agreed that the minimum charge would be proportionately reduced. The committee was not sure whether under that language, if the number of beds were reduced at any time, the county would have to agree or whether it was discretionary with the county. We at all times have interpreted the law to mean that whenever they reduced those beds, the county, of course, would reduce the minimum payment, but, of course, because of that misunderstanding, the item was disallowed.

Since that time, after consultation with the members of the subcommittee, I have taken up the matter with the county commissioners, so as to have a complete understanding about it, and I have now before me a telegram signed by the chairman of the county commissioners, Mr. Cornelius, and by Mr. Brunacini, chairman of the hospital board of trustees, which reads as follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., May 2, 1950.
HON. ANTONIO FERNANDEZ,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Contracts with Commissioner of Indian Affairs will include a provision whereby if pursuant to the act authorizing the appropriation for county-Indian hospital at Albuquerque, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reduces to less than 100 the number of beds required to be made available for Indians, the minimum payment to be made by said Commissioner will be proportionately reduced, and whereby if beds reserved for Indians are occupied by non-Indians said minimum payments will be reduced by the operators in proportion to such non-Indian occupancy. This provision is entirely satisfactory to the Bernalillo County commissioners and the hospital board of trustees.

We have always understood this to be the intent of the authorization act as passed last fall.

W. H. CORNELIUS,
Chairman, County Commissioners.
CHARLES C. BRUNACINI,
Chairman, Hospital Board of Trustees.

I think that that settles the question as to that rather ambiguous language.

Let me call to your attention one reason why I am so anxious, and why I plead with you, that this be restored. If this were an appropriation which we could consider next year, which could be postponed, I would not ask the House now to amend the bill. However, the county commissioners have their \$1,000,000 in the bank, and other moneys besides the bond money, on which they are paying interest to the bondholders. They have waited this long for the Federal Government to do its part in authorizing and in carrying out its part of the agreement. If this money is not made available this year, then the county commissioners of necessity must go ahead and build their own little hospital, and our opportunity to build a joint hospital will be gone. As a result, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs will have to come to Congress and get appropriations for a separate hospital. It will be much more expensive to the Federal Government, because it will have to construct, equip, and operate it, through its own personnel.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I have been interested in the title to the hospital and the ground on which it is to be constructed. Will the gentleman explain how the title is going to be held, who will own it, or what part, or something about that?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The tract of land on which the hospital will be built, if it is a joint hospital, is a tract of land where the Indian tuberculosis hospital is now located. This building will be adjacent to it. Under another act passed by the Congress, the Indian Office is authorized for this purpose to donate this land to the county. Consequently, the county will hold the title.

Mr. NORRELL. Will there be any record title in the Federal Government for its share of the funds extended, including the lot on which it is being constructed?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No; but of course the hospital will be dedicated to that purpose. Under the contract, it will be dedicated to that purpose in perpetuity. If at any time the county commissioners under this law should cease to operate it, then the Government may take it and operate it.

Mr. NORRELL. Then when the hospital is constructed, as far as the legal title is concerned, it will be vested in the county in which it is located?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I could not make the assertion definitely without checking the law, but I think it is vested in the county with the right of reversion if it is not used for that purpose. I am not certain about that.

Mr. NORRELL. At any rate, it would not be vested, or any part of it, in the Federal Government?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No; because it is a county hospital.

Mr. NORRELL. That is the objection I have had to the item all the time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is a county hospital, to be used for both the Indians and the non-Indians. In the use of the hospital, the county makes itself responsible for all expenses including any additions to the hospital and all the equipment of the hospital. The Federal Government is guaranteed the use of 100 beds, at least. Of course, we expect eventually to take over the health and hospital services for all Indians, and this is a step in that direction. That I think is the policy set by Mr. Nichols, the present Indian Commissioner, which is being followed by those two fine men in New Mexico, whom I mentioned, Mr. Brophy and Mr. Hagberg.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As I said if the appropriation is not made at this time then the law which was passed under the direction of the Committee on Public Lands will be completely nullified. It may be if our committee had been writing this law and had been making the arrangements we might have made different arrangements perhaps as to the title, I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas, and perhaps as to the formula for participation. But we did not write this law. The legislative committee of this House, the Committee on Public Lands, after full study by the Bureau of the Budget and taking the amendments which the Bureau of the Budget suggested, passed the authorization. They had the responsibility and gave the terms of the law most careful consideration. Consequently if we do not appropriate the money this year we will have completely nullified the act passed by this Congress for that purpose, and we will be arrogating to ourselves the responsibility already discharged by the legislative committee.

There is another thing I want to call to the attention of the Congress and particularly to the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas who is worried a little bit about the title. Under this bill the authority to pay for these 80 percent of beds expires by the specific provisions of the act in 1954 and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is then required to come back to the Congress and submit a report to us, in the light of its experience in this enterprise. Then the Congress is at liberty to make any kind of formula for the operation of this bill that the Congress sees fit. That is a rather onerous provision which was imposed on the county commissioners, for despite the fact that the authority to pay for these 80 percent of beds expires in 1954,

the provisions that the county shall continue to carry and maintain not less than 100 beds for the use of the Indians does not expire. They are obligated under this contract to that. So that if there is something in favor of the county commissioners which we might think is a little bit too favorable to them, there are these other provisions far more favorable to the Government, which we accepted because of the amendments suggested and required by the Bureau of the Budget. This is an experiment subject to adjustment, and the county authorities are willing to trust the good faith and good judgments of the Congress. Are we here to have less trust and confidence in the good faith and judgment of the Congress in the future?

Before I conclude let me read to you from the testimony given in the committee a statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], in the consideration of this bill, which I think should be given consideration. He said:

I would like to say also, Mr. Chairman, for the record that one of the greatest handicaps for the Indian Bureau working out some of these cooperative arrangements I think is a lack of getting through appropriations on time. It makes it very difficult to work out these cooperative arrangements with local people when appropriations are delayed and uncertain. I think that is quite a handicap to the Indian Bureau in that regard and I wish that some sort of a plan might be promoted to give local people a little better assurance in the future as to what you will do here so far as appropriations are concerned.

I fully agree with that. If this appropriation is not now granted despite the fact that the county commissioners have made their plans in reliance upon this law and have expended upward of \$75,000 in drawing up plans and specifications, and have waited this long, paying interest to bondholders on their money in the bank, if we do not now appropriate the money notwithstanding the fact that they have acted in reliance upon this act, then we will thereby discourage any further attempts along these lines in the future by these various communities, and it will be a retrogressive step in the attempt to integrate the health services of the Indians with those of the State. Such integration will save the Federal Government many more millions of dollars in cost of hospital operations alone. Certainly one large hospital can be operated more efficiently and more economically.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the time this matter was considered in the committee I had some grave doubts as to the protection being accorded the Federal Government. Since that time I have had a number of discussions with the gentleman from New Mexico. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment on the following conditions, and I desire to make this a part of the legislative history of this amendment:

That no part of the appropriation or authorization herein made shall be available

for the construction of a hospital pursuant to Public Law 438, approved October 31, 1949, unless the contract relating to such hospital between the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the proper authorities of the county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, shall include a provision whereby if pursuant to said act the Commissioner of Indian Affairs reduces to less than 100 the number of beds required to be made available for Indians, the operator shall agree that the minimum payment to be made by said Commissioner will be proportionately reduced, and whereby if beds reserved for Indians are occupied by non-Indians said minimum payment shall be reduced by the operator in proportion to such non-Indian occupancy.

With that statement and on that condition, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I certainly do appreciate the action of the gentleman from Washington. He has looked into this matter just as thoroughly as I have. We have been working at it ever since the committee met. This telegram which I have from the county commissioners does explicitly agree to those terms. Furthermore, the Indian Office has advised me, and were supposed to have sent me a letter to this effect, but I have not yet received, that that has been a part of the contract. It will be made a part of the contract.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The telegram has been read into the RECORD?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The telegram has been read into the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, certainly I believe this House knows of my great interest in preserving the health of our Indian population. I do not believe the Indian service has any better champion than I have been to that service. But it seems to me we are certainly deviating from the straight and narrow path as far as this Government is concerned.

I have no objection to building a general hospital for the Indians, but in Albuquerque we have a very fine tubercular institution for the Indians. Why we should help the State of New Mexico to build a hospital, not only for the Indians but for themselves, is beyond my comprehension. Certainly the other States of the Union are entitled to some consideration. The great State of New Mexico is to be lauded for its part in the matter, but, at the same time, it seems to me they are helping themselves too, by getting a very fine hospital and wanting the Federal Government to pay a million and a half dollars toward that, and at the same time maintain hospital beds for a certain proportion of the Indian patients when they are there. I just cannot see that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a matter of fact, it was not the county commissioners that wanted this done. It is a new policy of the Federal Government in try-

ing to integrate the health services of the Indians with those of the whites. It was the Indian Office that brought the proposition to them. It was the Indian Department that negotiated this matter. It is the Indian Office that wants us to do that.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, I may say to the gentleman from New Mexico that if we listen to the Indian Bureau, on medical matters, according to their past performance, then the Indians are in a poor way. That is all I have to say about that.

Now, may I refer to the report. This is not my language in the report, but it reflects the opinion of all the members of the subcommittee:

The amount of \$500,000 cash and \$1,000,000 in contract authority requested for the construction of a hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex., is not approved.

I did not write that language but it did reflect the opinion of all members of the subcommittee. Although the construction of this hospital is authorized by act of Congress, the committee is unwilling to recommend the appropriation requested for this purpose. This does not appear to be a hospital which would provide benefits for Indians commensurate with the expenditures planned. Certainly, for \$1,500,000, if there are only a few Indians in the hospital, they are not getting full value for what we are putting into it.

The proposed arrangement for having this hospital operated by the county in which it would be located, and the ambiguous provisions of the law respecting its operation have convinced the committee that it would be a bad precedent to appropriate funds for this construction.

I call particular attention to that portion of the report.

The subcommittee was in full accord; and, certainly, I for one have been very favorable to helping the Indians. I am not convinced that a general hospital for the Indians is so necessary in that particular section of the country. If additional Indian hospital facilities are to be built from money appropriated by this Congress, I think it should be in the form of an addition to the present Indian hospital in Albuquerque.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish to inform the House that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], a medical doctor, has been very active in trying to do everything he could for sick Indians. I can understand why he takes the position he does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly hesitate to go against Dr. FENTON's position, and I

shall not do it, because not only myself but most of the members of the committee have followed the gentleman from Pennsylvania on everything pertaining to the health of Indians.

The gentleman knows, does he not, that we made recommendations—or at least, I did after visiting the TB hospital in Albuquerque a few years ago; I recommended that we double the capacity of that hospital. There are something over 120 beds there now. The head of that hospital told me that with an extra doctor and a couple of extra nurses they could handle another 120 patients. No attention was paid to that recommendation. I am sorry they did not follow through in building an addition to the present TB hospital.

I hesitate, as does the doctor, to do anything that would hinder the Indians from getting the benefits they deserve and need; but I also hesitate to take issue with Dr. FENTON, who has taken care of this matter of Indian health not only for the minority side but also for the majority side of the committee for quite some years.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman contend that this amendment is not necessary or desirable in the interest of Indian health?

Mr. FENTON. That is absolutely correct, and I believe the subcommittee was of that frame of mind. We have no objection to hospitals being built for the Indians, but we feel that we should have some say in the matter; and, certainly, as my friend from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] pointed out, there are certain legal aspects of this problem as to title that are far from being cleared up.

Mr. TABER. In view of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, it seems to me that we ought to follow the judgment of those who have studied this thing thoroughly, as he has.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the authorization bill in regard to this matter came to our committee first, the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, it then went to the Public Lands Committee of the House and was reported in turn by that committee. I hope the members of this Committee of the Whole will restore this amount and will approve the pending amendment because it seems to me that to do otherwise is to more or less abandon a program that we have already agreed upon. We want to assimilate the Indians fully into our society. We just passed a bill here a day or so ago involving the city of Salamanca in New York based upon that very theory of assimilating the Indians into our society of giving them more autonomy of not considering them second-rate citizens but of giving them fuller status of citizenship.

This amendment is in keeping with that program. It will be a good economic move in the long run and is a move in the right direction, not only in the matter of assimilation but in the mat-

ter of integration of integrating the resources and the strength and the financial power of the local community, the county in this instance, with the United States Government so that each may supplement the other and help the other, a joint effort, if you please, beneficial to both parties, beneficial to the good people in that particular county and beneficial to our Indian friends.

Mr. Chairman, certainly this is in keeping with the program that we have, so far, it seems to me, already agreed upon. The authorization bill is a public law now and the authority therefore has been given. As I recall it, the President of the United States complimented the Congress at the time it passed such a law. I know a great many people did. So it seems to me in the long run it would be for economy, it would be in keeping with a program we have already agreed upon, it would be doing justice to our Indian friends, it would be helpful to everybody involved and, really, I cannot see why there should be any opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. I know the gentleman is a great admirer of the Indians and rightly so because he comes from a great State which has treated the Indians very fine.

Mr. MORRIS. We have tried to.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, the great State of Oklahoma does not ask for a hospital like this for its Indians.

Mr. MORRIS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. FENTON. The great State of Oklahoma would not come in and request this kind of legislation?

Mr. MORRIS. We would have no objection to this kind of legislation, I am certain we would not; in fact, we hope to have some similar legislation in the future.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. May I say to our distinguished friend this hearing was a very complete one. We had people from Bernalillo County who went into the matter very thoroughly with the Committee on Public Lands and the committee unanimously agreed that this is a very worthwhile project. We complimented the people in that area for the attitude they were taking in connection with our Indian brethren. We felt it was one of the most forward steps we had taken in trying to make the Indians a part of our society. I would feel very bad, I would regret very much, if now we would break faith with the people who had confidence in the Committee on Public Lands in its dealing with that problem.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is a member of our committee, he works faithfully and is interested, intensely, in the Indian problem and has given it a lot of study. His judgment, in my opinion, should carry great weight with this Congress.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This law is merely one of the various laws that we have been adopting here lately in pursuance of a new policy which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], on the other side of the aisle, has stressed time and again, and one that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and many others have stressed who have been studying the Indian problem. That is the problem of integrating rather than segregating the Indians. Our country would be happy to take them over and they expect to do it in time, but in building this hospital they want a little help at the present time, and that is all they asked for when the suggestion was made to them. It was done, as I say, by Mr. Brophy and Mr. Hageberg, who believe in that policy; a forward-looking policy. If this is not accomplished, it will be a retrogressive step in that policy. I do not know whether they have one in Oklahoma, but they passed one in Montana exactly like this. We have complained about the fact that the Indians do not have a single, solitary accredited hospital. They are unable to do so, because the Government has to spend a lot of money trying to get staffs and have not been able to do it. Now, in joining hands with the State, under a State administration, the hospital will be constructed and it will be fully accredited, and the Indians as well as the non-Indians will gain. Furthermore, it will be more expensive to the Government to turn this thing down, after it has been passed by the Congress, and that will be the effect unless we have the appropriation this year. It will be penny wise and pound foolish. It is not economy to deny these funds; it is economy to provide them and have the State run this hospital through its own staff and through its own officials in its own integrated system.

Mr. MORRIS. Let me say this in conclusion. The Indian problem, I think, is recognized, by practically all, if not all of us, as being a national problem. Uncle Sam, the Federal Government, has been building Indian hospitals for a long time and maintaining them, and it is now doing so. It seems to me that we ought to be grateful to the people in the great State of New Mexico who offer to help pay the bill. This is a program of economy for Uncle Sam. Heretofore Uncle Sam has been footing all the bills in matters of this kind and certainly we must take care of those Indians out there and see that they are given the same health opportunities that our other Indian friends are given, and

unless we do this jointly then it will be incumbent upon Uncle Sam to pay all of the bills. But these people in New Mexico offer to pay about half of the bills, or at least a large part of them, so why should we object to that. It just does not seem reasonable to me that we should.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FERNANDEZ), there were—ayes 32, noes 29.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FERNANDEZ and Mr. FENTON.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 57, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made, including unused balances of related contract authorizations, under the heads "Construction, and so forth, buildings and utilities, Indian Service," "Construction, and so forth, irrigation systems, Indian Service," "Roads, Indian Service," "Navajo and Hopi construction and maintenance services," and "Acquisition of lands for Indian tribes," shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the appropriation for the Indian Bureau came before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations certain testimony was given that subcommittee regarding money provided for Indian education in California, and other costs of the supervision of the Indian Bureau in that State.

The gentlemen on the committee will concur with me that certain Indians testified they desired independence from the Indian Bureau. Whether or not those Indians could be properly said to represent all the Indians of California or whether the testimony they gave was complete is not for me to discuss today. Neither is it for me to discuss whether or not the Indian Bureau should remove itself completely, or when, from the State of California.

The fact that we have for some 100 years professed to be trying to give the Indians their own independence, especially those Indians of the so-called Mission Indian Bands, and yet have not given them freedom, is something that requires discussion and action by the legislative committee. It is a fact that, whatever the case may be, it would be very difficult for the Indians if the subcommittee were to maintain the situation which now exists in this bill. The subcommittee removed all appropriations for Indian education, for the building of Indian schools, and for educational facilities in California.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DEWART. Last fall I had the opportunity to visit your mission school at Riverside, Calif., which is attended by several hundred Navajo Indians. I was amazed at the good work that school is doing and the education they are giving to the Indians. I think it would be too bad if the school is not carried on.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I believe it is the contention of the chairman of the subcommittee that the funds for this particular school were not excluded from the bill.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KIRWAN. If an injustice has been done to the Indians in California, I can assure the gentleman that when this bill goes to conference, after the Senate holds its hearings and we mark up the bill, I will make every effort to see that the injustice is corrected.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I knew he would do that. My point was simply that, even if the intent of the subcommittee to give independence to the Indians were carried out, it should not be done suddenly but should only be done when the State itself is given sufficient notice to arrange for educational facilities, the responsibility for which would then devolve upon the State.

I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the legislative subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. This matter has disturbed me greatly, inasmuch as I am chairman of the subcommittee dealing with it. After I found out the status of the present bill, I started an investigation to determine just what the effect is. I believe I have been reliably informed that all funds for the great State of California involving Indians have been completely eliminated.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That would be a very serious matter.

Mr. MORRIS. I think it is a serious matter. I know the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] will see that that wrong is righted, if it is humanly possible for him to do so. I hope we will not continue with a situation like that. For certainly, in my judgment, we should not cut off all the funds from the great State of California for the Indian Service, at least in one fell swoop. If we are going to do it, it should be done gradually.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to confirm what the gentleman has just stated. I do not believe the Indians who appeared before the committee were testifying for all the Indians of California. This is a very serious matter and I hope the cut that has been made can be restored.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to see the trend of thought here today because a great injustice has been done to the California Indians. The supposed representatives of the Indians, appearing before the committee, made statements which were not facts. The Hoopa authorization bill passed by the Congress last year, which I introduced and which was signed by the President, provided the necessary funds for the construction of the school facilities at the Hoopa Reservation, which funds are deleted entirely in the appropriation bill. The Indian and Federal holdings in that area do not develop any taxable property. The tax rate in the area is \$1.55 and the entire amount raised by taxes every year is \$560 on a small amount of personal property. They cannot build their own school facilities and must depend on Federal contribution; the State of California provides funds for the education of these Indian children; the Federal Government most certainly should provide the housing facilities. I have taken this problem up with the Senate committee and hope that the funds are reinstated.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I concur with the gentleman and say in conclusion that I shall offer no amendment here, to restore the funds deleted, having confidence that the matter will be corrected in the other body.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. California has been mistreated in the striking of all of the funds for the Indians of California. It was done on the statement of one man to the effect that he represented the Indians of California. The State authorities were never given an opportunity to be heard, nor were any other Indian groups who dispute the statement that they were properly represented, or represented at all, by the gentleman who appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee. As a matter of fact, the Governor of California, the superintendent of public instruction, and many of the officials of local government vigorously protest the withdrawal of these funds. Many Indian groups have protested to me and to other California Congressmen. It will inflict an unfair hardship on the Indians of California and upon local and State school and health agencies. It is discriminatory against California. When all Indians in every State are deprived of Federal funds as a matter of national policy we will be willing to take our cut along with the rest. But as long as that is not done, the California Indians should not be treated any differently than the others, and our State should not be required to take over and carry a burden which is a

Federal obligation and which is not imposed similarly on other States.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed 227, of which 220 shall be for replacement only) and hire of passenger-motor vehicles, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; printing and binding, including illustrations and purchase of reprints; purchase of ice for official use of employees; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), including not to exceed \$5,000 for expenditure at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem on irrigation and power matters, when authorized by the Secretary; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 227, after line 12, add the following new paragraph:

"Not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds herein provided for the Bureau of Indian Affairs shall be available for travel expenses."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the same category as the one I offered earlier in the afternoon in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration.

The amendment seeks to reduce the travel pay for the Bureau of Indian Affairs from \$1,400,000 to an even \$1,000,000, a reduction of \$400,000.

If every Member of this House, if every American who can understand the American language, would have the privilege of knowing some of the things that are going on in the Indian Bureau, I am sure there would not be very little opposition to this amendment. Certainly the Bureau of Indian Affairs has done a great many things that were neither good for the Indians nor good for America in general as most of you know, I am sure.

Here they are asking for \$1,400,000 just for travel expenses. It is criminal, purely and simply criminal, for the American taxpayers to pay \$1,400,000 just for travel expenses for the officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Of course, a lot of us do not know anything about this. Where are they going to travel?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, we have an Indian Office here in Washington. Then we have a half dozen regional offices scattered all over the country. Then we have district offices, and we have local offices, and we have reservation offices, and they are filled with a lot of folks that do not have much else to do than travel around over the country, and so they just travel, when a letter or a telephone call would do just as well and possibly better. That is the answer. In fact, if I had my way, every regional office in the Indian Bureau would be abolished; in fact, we did abolish some of them during the Eightieth Congress, and it was good for the Indians.

Mr. VURSELL. How much are we spending on the Indians now?

Mr. JENSEN. The budget request for the fiscal year 1951 was the sum of \$85,996,375. Our committee reduced that amount to \$76,293,000, a reduction of \$9,703,375, which is by far the greatest amount ever before requested for the Bureau. But I am afraid the Indian people will not benefit anywhere near in proportion.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I intend to offer such an amendment as the gentleman has suggested on page 229, to abolish these regional Indian offices and cut out the appropriation.

Mr. JENSEN. I shall be glad to support the gentleman's amendment if it is clean-cut and will actually save some money.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Talking about travel expense, that is where the great increase comes in, traveling back and forth between regional offices.

Mr. JENSEN. And doing nothing but trying to tell the Indians what they should do; when, generally speaking, the Indians are smarter than the white folks who are trying to tell them a lot of stuff they already know.

I am sorry that Mr. William Brophy was not able to continue his work. He was the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for a couple of years and was doing fine work. Then he got sick and had to resign over a year or so ago. Since that time we have been going back to about the same kind of mess we had when Mr. Collier was Commissioner of Indian Affairs. For the past few months we have had a Commissioner of Indian Affairs by the name of Nichols, but he had too much common sense; he was doing too good a job. They could not handle him and so they replaced him with one Dillon Myer, who tried to handle the Japanese concentration camps during the war, and I have been told by good authority that they had more trouble with Dillon Myer than they did with all the Japanese in those camps.

Listen to this, my colleagues: Here is what Col. W. D. Archie, of military police, who had considerable to do with Japanese concentration camps during World War II, had to say in his own newspaper, the Shenandoah Sentinel, of Shenandoah, Iowa, about the recent appointment of Dillon Myer as Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

ALONG THE BANKS OF THE NISHNA

(By W. D. Archie)

Dillon F. Myer has been chosen as head of the Bureau of Indian Affairs by President Truman. It sickens me to think such a thing can happen in our Government. It shows what a low state we are in, and why such men as Senator McCARTHY are forced to such extremes to try to clean up the sordid Washington mess among Government employees. Not that Myer is not a good American. He is just inefficient.

This Dillon Myer is one of the original New Dealers. He has little ability but plenty of pull. He gets into trouble in every job he is given but is immediately transferred to a better one every time this happens. During the war he headed the Japanese relocation camps and I personally had contact with these camps. He made more trouble

than did all the Japs in the camps. Every decision he made was on the basis of new dealism. Along toward the end of the war it got so bad he was transferred. But he didn't lose his job with the Government. Instead he was soon found to be heading one of the big housing jobs.

Now he is to head the important Bureau of Indian Affairs. The poor Indians. They have been mistreated by our Government from the very beginning and now they must suffer with this man Myer. And as I said in the beginning it is sickening that such a thing can happen in our Government.

I trust my amendment will be adopted. Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to the one previously offered in connection with the Bonneville Power Administration. I hope the Committee will vote it down.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. How do they spend all this million and a half? What is it used for?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I may state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the amount approved for the current fiscal year is \$1,030,000. The Budget estimate for the fiscal year was \$1,400,023.

We must take into consideration that the program, particularly for hospitalization, and for schools, represents a substantial expansion in this bill. In addition, per diem costs were raised from \$6 to \$9 by the Congress last year and we are bound by that law; also, the mileage cost for the use of private automobiles was also increased. Furthermore, the area covered by the Indian Service is very substantial. If you look at a map of New Mexico and Arizona you will see what tremendous areas have to be covered and what a transportation problem this offers. The Indian reservations in these States are larger than some States of the Union. To administer such a tremendous program entails some expense.

Our subcommittee wants to hold costs down and we have cut the Indian Bureau substantially. We have tried to approve those items relating to hospitalization, education, and to approve also programs that have been suggested to get the Indians off the reservation into jobs where they can be assimilated into the community. That is our objective.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JACKSON, of Washington) there were—ayes 40, noes 51.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JENSEN and Mr. JACKSON of Washington.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after June 30, 1950.

PROCEEDS FROM POWER

After June 30, 1950, not to exceed the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, shall be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 227, lines 13 to 18, inclusive, and on page 227, lines 19 to 25, inclusive, and page 228, lines 1 and 2 on the ground that it is permanent legislation on an appropriation bill.

The language to which the point of order is made is as follows:

CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary after June 30, 1950.

PROCEEDS FROM POWER

After June 30, 1950, not to exceed the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, shall be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the act of August 7, 1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede both points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the points of order.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 227 after line 12 insert the following:

"CLAIMS AND TREATY OBLIGATIONS

"For fulfilling treaties with Senecas and Six Nations of New York, Choctaws and Pawnees of Oklahoma, and payment to Indians of Sioux reservations, to be expended as provided by law, such amounts as may be necessary during the current fiscal year.

"PROCEEDS FROM POWER

"Sums not in excess of the amount of power revenues covered into the Treasury to the credit of each of the power projects, including revenues credited prior to August 7, 1946, to be available for the purposes authorized by section 3 of the act of August 7,

1946 (Public Law 647), as amended, including printing and binding, in connection with the respective projects from which such revenues are derived."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$2,525,465 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; printing and binding; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a recreational director for the Menominee Reservation and a curator for the Osage Museum, each of whom shall be appointed with the approval of the respective tribal councils and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That \$100,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available from the judgment fund appropriated for the Indians of California by section 203 of the act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 77), to be advanced for compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians of California under contracts approved by the Secretary, each such advance creating a charge on any judgment or settlement won by such tribe, band, or group, reimbursable out of such judgment or settlement, with interest at 4 percent per annum, to the judgment fund of the Indians of California: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary. Any tribal funds advanced under this authority shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget for the next succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, against the language commencing with the word "*Provided*" in line 3, page 229, reading:

That \$100,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available from the judgment fund appropriated for the Indians of California by section 203 of the Act of April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 77), to be advanced for compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by any tribe, band, or other identifiable group of Indians of California under contracts approved by the Secretary, each such advance creating a charge on any judgment or settlement won by such tribe, band, or group, reimbursable out of such judgment or settlement, with interest

at 4 percent per annum, to the judgment fund of the Indians of California.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: On page 229, after line 21, insert the following:

"No part of the funds herein appropriated under the head 'Bureau of Indian Affairs' shall be used for the establishment or maintenance in the United States, exclusive of Alaska, of area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs by whatever term such offices may be designated or for the compensation of employees in such offices, but this limitation shall not prevent the allocation of funds, otherwise expendable in connection with such area offices, for use in the improvement of services rendered to Indians in their home communities."

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, this amendment when passed will abolish the so-called area offices of the Indian Bureau located in various cities of the United States. In offering this amendment it is not proposed to reduce the appropriation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but that such funds be utilized for the improvement of services in their home communities. The program of maintaining an area office by the Indian Bureau has been in existence for several years. Many of these regional offices have been abolished at one time or another, but have always managed to crop up again under different names, and at the present time 11 area offices are now in existence. The contention of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is that they can give better services to Indians by decentralizing authority between Washington and the Indian reservations. Under this three-level system of administration the Indians have experienced such inconveniences as lack of local government services, delay by additional red tape, and general inefficiency which has stymied the progress of the Indians whom the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is intended to help.

The following data, compiled from the many communications received in favor of this proposed amendment, produce irrefutable evidence to justify the abolishment of the area-office method of administration of Indian affairs.

DISADVANTAGES OF AREA OFFICES

First. Geographic locations: Area offices are usually located in cities hundreds of miles away, where the Indian Bureau representatives are not in contact with Indian problems and are not aware of reservation needs.

Second. Misleading theory in authority delegation: While the area-office idea of the Bureau of Indian Affairs was to decentralize authority from Washington to the field where it would be readily accessible to Indians on reservations, this theory of middleman-area office by rank of position has automatically absorbed

essential authority from reservations; it is the belief of the Indians that, because of their proper locations in the field, the reservation superintendents are in daily contact with their Indians' problems and should, therefore, retain the final authority in important recommendations to Washington.

Third. Slows up procedures: In matters requiring immediate decisions, the problems are first routed to the area offices to secure their recommendations, before they are passed on to the final authority, which is the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Washington, D. C.

Fourth. Encourages irrational decisions: In many cases, recommendations in important decisions are given arbitrarily by the area directors who, being miles away from Indian reservations, and, due to lack of sufficient time for thorough investigations of cases involved, would naturally lack first-hand information to give such problems just recommendations.

Fifth. "Mice will play when cat is away": When authority is delegated from Washington to the field, it should be given to the reservation superintendents; or, better still, to the Indians themselves. No authority should be delegated to a "no-man's-land" between Washington and the reservations. What is done by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and his staff in Washington is under constant scrutiny by Congress; and what is done by the reservation superintendent and his staff in the field is under constant scrutiny by the Indians. But what is done in area offices far from Washington and far from any Indian reservation is not subject to anybody's scrutiny and is productive of waste and delay.

Sixth. Prevents Indian participation: Where an area office is hundreds of miles away, in some cases, more than 600 miles, the Indians cannot participate in a program intended for them because of lack of proper guidance and protection by Indian service personnel, and hence lose all interest in any beginning toward the Government's plans for Indian self-government. This system encourages the Bureau to cling to the now obsolete idea of working out problems for the Indians, rather than the doctrine they preach of working with them to solve their own problems.

Seventh. Deprives Indians of needed services: The operation of the area office system of administration has resulted in the separation of personnel badly needed on the reservation agencies, such as extension workers, nurses, Indian police, judges, and other positions most essential to the needs of the reservations; and funds denied from these positions have been used to establish and maintain the area offices.

Eighth. Waste of taxpayers' money: The three-level system of Indian Bureau administration is a waste of taxpayers' money, since it is used to maintain an expensive yet mythical branch of the Indian service which is of no value to Indians in their intended program of progress. It misrepresents

what would be the true objectives of the Indian service, with its top-heavy emphasis in merely perfecting standards of operations within the Bureau to protect its employees, at the expense of denying the Indians' greatest need for moral, social, and economic development. The existence of any branch of the Indian service can only be justified by the services it renders to Indians, and the area offices are a far cry in their present status, to be of any value whatsoever to Indians within their reservations.

Ninth. Establishment lacks Indians' consent: The establishment of area offices which unjustly deprived the Indians of Indian service personnel on their reservations, was carried out in secrecy, without due consent of the Indians.

Tenth. Road to false freedom: Ninety percent of the Indians residing within Indian reservations are at present against the program of so-called Indian emancipation. Although the Indians have never been directly informed, this area-office program of withdrawal from Indian reservations fits into a pattern using the area-office system as a painless method of emancipating the Indians, better referred to by the Indians as "false freedom." The Indians' reason for opposing such a measure is that if in their present status, and without further preparations, their wardship should be removed, they would fall prey to land-hungry, non-Indian exploiters who would eventually deprive them of land and property upon which hinges their very existence. This area-office method, withdrawing personnel from reservations, is a make-believe that Indians are about ready to be turned loose, and is certainly paving the way to just such a false freedom.

Eleventh. Area-office abolition recommended by NCAI: Under date of September 24, 1949, at the convention of the National Congress of American Indians, held in Rapid City, S. Dak., the following resolution was proposed and approved by an overwhelming majority of the more than 200 Indian delegates present, representing more than 25 of our 48 States:

Whereas the proposed system of area offices of the Indian Office will involve expenditures of additional money that could be better used at the agencies themselves; and

Whereas it is more efficient to place local power in the superintendent, instead of vesting it in area or national officials; and

Whereas the Commissioner has promised the abolition of district offices so that more money will go to the reservations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Congress of American Indians opposes the plan for establishment of area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and request more powers be vested in local superintendents and local councils.

I have read with great disappointment Indian Office Order No. 549, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, September 13, 1949, a program of Indian Bureau reorganization. This program of reorganization, while it could have been designed to meet the Indians' greatest needs, is in substance patterned merely to better intra-Bureau relationships. It

selfishly aims, at prohibitive cost, to keep the Bureau of Indian Affairs in line with regulations prescribed by such agencies as the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Civil Service Commission, thus protecting heads of departments as well as subordinate employees within the Bureau. It fails in its entirety to meet the needs of the Indians themselves, in their honest efforts to attain standards of progress established by our civilization.

At this critical time, when foreign countries are watching us with critical eye, looking for shortcomings of our Government in dealing with minority groups, it is best that we deal with greater zeal and sincerity with our local Indian people. At present we are going all out to feed and support foreign countries, even to the extent of jeopardizing the economic soundness of our country, yet we forget to take care of our just obligations at home. Our assistance to foreign nations is charity. But we cannot look upon our aid in the form of services to our Indians as charity. These services which we can render them are restitutions and part of the price we have offered to our American Indian people from whom we have ruthlessly confiscated lands rich in resources, that have made our country the greatest in the world today.

With all the handicaps and limitations circumstances have placed upon them, our Indian people on the reservations are striving wholeheartedly to meet the requirements set forth by our fast-moving civilization. With their population of less than 400,000 in the United States, they without question answered our country's call in time of war, thus joining us in our efforts to retain the American way of life. As an example, on the Coeur d'Alene Reservation, with a population of less than 700, more than 30 Indian boys entered the services of our armed forces; 11 of them were volunteers; and 6 of them gave their lives for our common cause. In return for which, rather than gratitude, the Bureau of Indian Affairs continues to employ irrational methods of administration, many of which have resulted in pushing our young Indian men into the gutters of failure and despair. This method of area-office administration, in itself, holds an intrinsic evil in that it utterly uses funds for a purpose other than for what it is intended.

I, therefore, strongly urge my colleagues in Congress to adopt this worthy amendment to abolish the area offices in order that our Indians may realize the justice and securities that we have so solemnly promised them in past treaties.

May I again emphasize that the area-office plan of administration of Indian Affairs seeks only to protect its heads of departments and its employees within the Bureau and hence does not attain the purpose for which Indian-service funds are annually appropriated. Let us disperse this idea and reestablish personnel back to the Indian reservations to serve as guidance, and to protect our Indians in their own efforts to attain eventual total self-sufficiency.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Just what does the gentleman's amendment do? May I ask him whether it is a clean-cut amendment to abolish the regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and by so doing will it reduce this appropriation by the amount that the regional offices are costing? Just what does the amendment do?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. What this amendment proposes to do is to abolish the regional offices so that the money will go to administer the affairs of the Indians on the Indian reservations which will otherwise be spent for traveling and for maintenance and for salaries of an area office force far removed from the Indians.

Mr. JENSEN. I wish the gentleman's amendment were clean-cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, if we are interested in economy, if we are interested in carrying out the policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in contracting the Indians and administering their affairs, we should abolish these regional offices.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree with the gentleman that we should abolish the regional offices, but I am afraid the gentleman's amendment is not going to do much good for the Indian service. Certainly we need to do more than just abolish the offices and then take the same personnel which they will put into all these reservation headquarters so that we will have the same bunch to contend with again. They will just make regional offices out of every one of the reservation offices under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I do not think that would be done.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sorry, but I just cannot see that.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I think money would be saved by abolishing these offices and the money saved would help the Indians rather than be spent to maintain distant offices which will not be in contact with the Indians and which defeat the purpose of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I hope the gentleman will vote for the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is inserted herewith a letter from Lyzeme Savage, manager of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, which is one of a large number of letters received in support of this legislation.

MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE,
Cass Lake, Minn., April 28, 1950.
Representative WHITE, Democrat, Idaho,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WHITE: I am sending along a clipping taken from the Minneapolis Star of Wednesday evening, April 26, 1950. The amendment you propose to have added to the section covering

the Interior Department bill, Bureau of Indian Affairs, is in agreement with the thinking of the Minnesota Tribe, which includes 15,000 enrollees. As you probably are aware, Public Law 841, Eightieth Congress, for the fiscal year of 1949, stipulated and provided funds for district offices at Billings and Portland only; however, the upkeep of three others were maintained notwithstanding. This undoubtedly was done with the hope and plan of reestablishing a better and more elaborate set-up.

For the fiscal year of 1951, there were set up 11 area offices which is nothing more than the old district offices. The decentralization so far has done nothing to reduce the house-keeping work at the agencies, neither has it benefited the Indians more—on the contrary it has increased the load of our skeleton forces. Elimination of the needless district, regional, and area offices perhaps would be gained if the title of appropriations were changed from "Field" Administration to "Reservation" Administration, and if stipulation were included in your amendment that appropriated funds are to be used only for those reservation agencies which were established prior to the setting up of the so-called district, regional, and area offices.

Example after example can and has undoubtedly been presented to you showing the inefficiency of operations, the overlapping of work phases, and the last but not least, excessive cost of over-all operations. The procedure is simple, for if overhead costs are cut, the profit is greater. What the Indian needs is greater profit from the funds a generous Congress appropriates.

As manager of the tribe here and speaking in their behalf, I urge you to have an amendment to the bill made as stipulated and I trust other lawmakers will aid in its becoming law. Such would mean much to the Indians; we need more aid, and do not desire to be used as tools for a "build-up to brass."

Very truly yours,

LYZEME SAVAGE, Manager.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, last fall I had opportunity to visit the Indian school at Riverside, Calif. The school is attended largely by several hundred Navajo Indian boys and girls, from the ages of 9 or 10 to 17. These pupils do all their own work, under the supervision of a few teachers. They keep their rooms, maintain the buildings and grounds in immaculate order; they prepare their own meals and even cobble their shoes. I visited the shops, as well as the class rooms where they learn to read and write, and by doing all of these things, they become proficient in home economics and various trades.

I have never visited a school which was run more efficiently or where the students were more attentive and interested in their studies.

I was much impressed by this school and I am glad to have this opportunity to tell the Congress about this splendid institution.

I would like also to mention briefly the matter of education of Indian children in public schools through tuition contracts between the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the States. One of these contracts covers the education of Indian children in the public schools of Montana.

This is an excellent system of securing a proper education for the Indian children, and beyond that it is the best possible step toward making the Indian a real citizen and equal member of our society. The Indian and non-Indian children work and learn and play together. It is a healthy situation and one which will contribute greatly to the eventual end of the wardship status of the American Indian.

At present there is some difficulty in my State about the amounts of tuition to be paid by the Federal Government. State education authorities feel that they must have sizable increases over the amounts appropriated in 1950 and in the present bill. A matter of policy is involved which must be settled before it jeopardizes the success of this education program. One thing is certain: Where the Indian children are attending public schools in large numbers, in reservation districts where the trust status of Indian land reduces the tax base to a point where any kind of school is difficult to support, the Federal government must be prepared to pay its proper share of the cost of operating the schools. There should be no quibbling and no shirking of responsibility in this important obligation. It is an obligation both to the Indians and to the non-Indian citizens who are cooperating in this public-education program.

Mr. Chairman, the question raised by this amendment, concerning the operation of area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, is one which has been discussed frequently in recent years and one with which I am familiar.

The original idea of decentralizing Indian Bureau affairs by establishing area offices, close to the reservations, where the bulk of Indian business could be transacted, was a good idea. The objections we are now hearing from many Indian tribes is not, I feel, an objection to this idea. It is an objection to the manner in which the system has operated.

I think the Indians would have no objection if they were able to send their business to the Billings, Mont., office, for example, and have it handled there speedily and effectively by men who were close enough to the problems to have a real understanding of them. When in the past I have defended the area-office system, I have done so because I believed that this was the intention of the Bureau.

We find, however, that the Bureau has in many instances failed to give the area offices a sufficiently clear outline of responsibility or sufficient authority to enable them to operate effectively and as the time-saving agency they should be.

Recently there has been an oil development on the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana. Oil leases have been signed which mean money to the Indians. Amounts of from several hundred to perhaps several thousand dollars are coming to the Indians as a result of this development. The leases were sent to the Billings area office for review. They were reviewed there, fully and in detail, or so I am informed. If the area-office system were working properly, that should have been enough. But now we

find that these same leases have been in Washington several weeks where a man has been detailed by the Indian Office to review them once again. Final approval has been delayed. There is an apparent duplication of effort. The money these Fort Peck people need so badly, money they should have so that they can get started again after a very difficult winter, is still held up by the rigamarole of review and review.

If we are going to have area offices, we should let them do the work. If we are not going to let them do the work, we may as well not have them.

I have found that in many instances the Billings area office has been of real value. However, to the individual Indians who have business to transact, it appears to be just another bureau where their business is delayed. No one can blame them for wanting to do away with this extra delay. However, in my own opinion it is the Washington office rather than the Billings office that has failed in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE of Idaho) there were—ayes 7, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STIGLER: On page 228, line 6, strike out "\$2,525,465" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,530,965."

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment resulted from a request by the Creek Tribe of Indians of our State for \$5,500 of their tribal funds to acquire approximately 35 acres of land adjoining the Creek Indian school located at Eufaula. A resolution was passed by the Creek Tribal Council and a request was sent to us. I appeared before the committee. It was thought after the bill was marked up that sufficient authority was contained in this section to grant the request of the Creek Indians. Upon contacting the budget officer and the budget officer for the Indian Office, it was thought that this amount of \$5,500 should be added to the total so that there could not be any question about the authority. Subsequent to that time I have contacted the majority members of the subcommittee, as well as the minority members, and I was advised that there is no objection to offering the amendment on the floor.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is in order, and we accept it.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. STIGLER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Since the amendment was prepared by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] I invite his attention to the fact that a point of order has been made to the item appearing on page 229, beginning in line 3 running through line 14, which had the effect of removing \$100,000 that had been previously included in the bill for attorneys' fees for the California tribe. In view of that, I desire to offer

a substitute amendment which will reduce the over-all figure by that amount, \$100,000, which will have the effect of taking care of the item reduced by the point of order, and will also take care of the item that the gentleman has spoken of, which I accept.

Mr. STIGLER. That is agreeable to me.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington to the amendment offered by Mr. STIGLER: Strike out "\$2,530,965" and insert "\$2,430,965."

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATION

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs and specifications for authorized Federal reclamation projects or parts thereof prior to appropriations for construction of such projects or parts; and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects; to remain available until expended, \$5,150,000, of which \$4,400,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and \$500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations: *Provided further*, That the limitation on the amount available for surveys and preconstruction work in connection with the North Side pumping division, Minidoka project, Idaho, stated in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1950, is increased from \$725,000 to \$1,000,000: *Provided further*, That, except as herein expressly provided with respect to investigations in Alaska, no part of this appropriation shall be expended in the conduct of activities which are not authorized by law.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER:

On page 230, line 15, strike out "\$5,150,000" and insert "\$2,500,000".

On page 230, line 16, strike out "\$4,400,000" and insert "\$2,200,000".

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to reduce the funds for general investigations, economic investigations, and engineering investigations on proposed Federal reclamation projects, and studies of water conservation and development plans, by \$2,500,000. This is my objective; let me

state my reasons: In the rivers-and-harbors and flood-control set-up we have wiped out the provision for planning to develop new projects. At this time, when there is absolutely no excuse for embarking on any new reclamation projects, why we should continue planning for additional reclamation projects is beyond me. The situation at the present time, a situation that will probably continue for a great many years, is that we have a production of wheat nearly double the requirements of the United States and what we can sell, and there is a similar picture with reference to corn and other agricultural products. Why, at a time when we do not need the land, we should spend enormous sums of money for the development of plans for new reclamation projects is beyond any reasonable conception.

I am not hostile to the development of reclamation projects where we need the resources, but to develop new agricultural lands and new agricultural production for the purpose of providing a surplus which the Department or somebody else must immediately take off the market by an expenditure of Federal funds is beyond my comprehension. There must come a time when we approach this situation honestly and fairly, and do not approach it with the idea of just spending money and destroying the United States. I appreciate that people like to have expenditures made in their territory; frankly, there are a lot of people in my own territory who would like to have Federal money poured in there, but at this time when we have not the money to pay for it, when we have a deficit in sight, an admitted deficit of \$6,000,000,000 for this year, and perhaps \$7,000,000,000 for next, at a time when we have declining revenues, how we can afford not to cut down at every opportunity that presents itself, how we can afford to go on developing plans for something we ought not to embark upon and that we know we ought not to embark upon for a great many years, is way beyond my comprehension.

I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we will take advantage of the opportunity to save \$2,650,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I certainly share the gentleman's views. I call his attention to the fact that with the condition of the Federal purse what it is today, we have a provision in this bill for investigation for new projects that is even greater than a similar provision carried in last year's bill.

Mr. TABER. That is correct and there is absolutely to excuse for it because our situation is such that we ought to avoid every possible unnecessary expenditure.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

This reads:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and

development plans; engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the war resources of Alaska; formulating plans and preparing designs.

Is there any Member of this Congress who wants to cut investigations down to \$2,500,000 for Alaska where we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars right now on defense projects? Suppose the armed forces—Army, Navy, or Air Force—asked for houses and water up there in that part of our country? Who is going to give it to them? Where is the information coming from? It has got to come from the Department of the Interior primarily.

Mr. TABER. There is plenty of money available to take care of the Alaskan situation in the two and one-half millions I have left in the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. No. This is the one part of this bill where we made a really substantial cut.

Mr. TABER. A cut was made there, yes, but the committee still has allowed more money than this agency had last year.

Mr. KIRWAN. There is, as the gentleman well knows, more work going on in Alaska today than ever before and necessarily so.

Mr. TABER. You do not need anything outside of the Alaska job.

Mr. KIRWAN. You do not need it?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. KIRWAN. If there is any information needed anywhere in this country who is going to furnish it? We have robbed this Nation for the last 200 or 300 years of its resources. Now we could spend millions of dollars on investigation to find out how to go about the work of replenishing some of our vanishing resources, putting back into the Nation what we took out of it. I repeat, again, there is not a Member of this Congress who wants to see the terrible situation in Alaska as it is depicted in the magazines.

We should have learned our lesson in the recent war when we built the Alcan Highway. We did not have the proper information, and we never allowed the Army and the Bureau of Public Roads money for investigation. The Army came along and spent hundreds of millions of dollars on a highway that should never have been built. Yet we protest vigorously about allowing \$2,000,000 for investigations. When we want to do something we are not prepared to do it because we are afraid to face up to realities.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the justification for this item, pages 168 and 169 of the hearings, there is not anything said about Alaska. It all has to do with other places insofar as any of them are specifically mentioned.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman, as the RECORD will show, wants to make a cut in the \$5,000,000 item reading "and for

reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska."

Mr. TABER. The Alaska investigations are only \$250,000. The two and one-half million dollars that are left would take care of that 10 times over.

Mr. KIRWAN. Does the gentleman realize how much water it takes to make 1 ton of steel?

Mr. TABER. I do not know.

Mr. KEATING. Water is our finest and greatest mineral. It takes about 250 tons of water to make 1 ton of steel. That is a part of the investigation.

Mr. TABER. There is no steel in this bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. This is for investigations to get water to make steel and other beneficial uses.

Mr. TABER. Where do you get steel anywhere around where this Territory is located?

Mr. KIRWAN. This item is for an investigation of our water and other resources all over America. The Geological Survey has men all along the streams, in all our steel valleys, testing the water datum. That comes out of the fund for this Department, whether it is in Youngstown, Ohio, Chicago, Utah, or Alaska. All over this Nation you will find men setting up the instruments along the streams investigating the water.

I again say do not start cutting or trying to cut this one thing which covers investigations of our natural resources, and which is what we need to keep this country in a proper perspective.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I have already had complaints from my area that this committee, with the pending provision—not the amendment suggested, but the existing provision—has cut this to the bone.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; and you are not alone.

Mr. CARROLL. I find that during the fiscal year 1951 that the Bureau of Reclamation asked for \$12,500,000, and the Bureau of the Budget cut that to \$7,800,000, and then the committee cut it again to \$5,500,000.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is the one part of the bill that our committee cut more than any other part.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 42, noes 53.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment apply to

the section just read and the succeeding section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the amendment to the succeeding section affect the dollar amount in those sections?

Mr. HOLMES. It will not affect the over-all total of the bill but it will affect the dollar amount in both sections; both the section first read and the succeeding section.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will it affect the dollar amount in the next succeeding section?

Mr. HOLMES. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]:

On page 230, line 13, after the word "expended", insert the sum "\$4,975,000", instead of "\$5,150,000."

Page 230, line 16, after the word "which", insert the sum "\$4,225,000", instead of "\$4,400,000."

Page 231, line 11, after the word "expended", insert "\$297,642,000", instead of "\$297,467,000."

Page 231, line 12, after the word "which", insert "\$23,072,700", instead of "\$22,897,700."

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, while this amendment sounds a little intricate, it is a very simple amendment, which is why I submitted the request I did. It takes from the general investigation funds \$175,000 and adds to the construction funds this same \$175,000.

The reason for this amendment is this: The Budget allowed the Kennewick extension of the Yakima project in the State of Washington \$175,000 of planning money. It therefore will not affect the planning or investigation moneys for any other projects.

The Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations in its report on page 172, at the bottom of the page, states as follows:

The committee does not agree with the determination of the Bureau of the Budget in rejecting appropriations for the construction of the Kennewick division, Yakima project, Washington, under this expression of policy. The committee has considered this division and has determined that it is not a new project but is part of the Yakima project under such policy.

Therefore, the purpose of this amendment, without interfering with budget approval or without interfering with investigation moneys for any other projects in the United States, is merely to transfer the \$175,000 for planning on the Kennewick division of the Yakima project from that category of investigation to the category of construction money for that project, under the suggestion of the committee's statement that it is not considered by the committee as a new project.

I urge that this amendment be adopted and that the \$175,000 be placed in the category of aid to construction.

In closing, may I add that the transfer of these moneys will not in any way change the total sum of money involved in the entire bill. It merely transfers \$175,000 from general investigations to the construction moneys in the succeeding chapter, under the unanimous consent to offer the amendment in this form.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that much investigation, in fact, sufficient investigation has already been made on the Kennewick project in years gone by, and that the gentleman's amendment, instead of costing anything, will actually save \$175,000 because that \$175,000, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, will now be used on the construction of the project. We know the project will be constructed because it is authorized.

Mr. HOLMES. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. It is a very worthwhile project.

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. May I call your attention to the importance of starting construction with this money in the manner I have suggested by this amendment. When the Hanford Engineering Works came into existence in this area of the State of Washington there was taken out of production approximately 7,000 acres of irrigated land under that condemnation. This will in turn start the construction of this division, which seeks to put back into economic balance the agricultural economy of that area.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLMES. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. What is the nature of this project?

Mr. HOLMES. An irrigation and multiple-purpose project.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington made a request of me when we started on the bill this afternoon and the request was fine and quite in order. I gave him my word that I would not object to the statement which he has just made. He has made a request to shift \$175,000 from investigations to the Kennewick project. He made this request on the basis of the fact that the committee said in its report they thought this was not a new project. We did make that report but there was no money in the budget for this project. We did give our opinion that we thought it was not a new project.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. There was \$175,000 of investigational money allowed for this project, was there not?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, for investigations but not for construction.

Mr. HOLMES. Would not the gentleman agree that having carried on the investigation as far as it has gone, and

we know we are capable of going ahead with construction, that the transfer of this \$175,000 which is a budget item would not in any way interfere with any other investigation and we could just as well go on with the construction of the project in the face of the fact that the committee reports they do not think this is a new project and it would not be ruled out on that basis?

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman from Washington is correct in that statement.

The committee made that report that they did not think it was a new project. But there is no money in the budget for construction. I, as a member of the committee, do not think that is a good thing to transfer funds for investigation purposes to start construction. If we set this precedent practically every Member who has a project in his district would ask for the same consideration.

Mr. HOLMES. Would it not be a point of importance in relation to this amendment to try in the face of the committee's opinion that it is not a new project to get this land into irrigation and under cultivation as fast as we can, to take the place of the land which was taken out by the condemnation of the Hanford Engineering Works under the war emergency? I believe that makes for a unique situation with respect to this particular amendment.

Mr. KIRWAN. I agree with what the gentleman has said. There may be several things in his favor here but there is no money requested from the budget for construction. This committee made the determination when they sat down that they were going to try to cut this bill. Many Members wanted some money for a project in their district which the committee would not allow.

Mr. HOLMES. The fact that there was no money in this bill recommended by the budget for construction is because it was ruled that it was a new project. But since the committee has disagreed with the Bureau does that not make a difference? And give the power of authorizing this money for construction?

Mr. KIRWAN. This is why the committee disagreed. They said that when the Bureau of the Budget read our report, if they do read it, then maybe next year they would come to an understanding that the Congress recognized this project as not being a new project and they would make a request for funds.

Mr. HOLMES. Because of the emergency situation caused by the great influx of population there and the condemnation that took approximately 7,000 acres of land would you not consider it a matter of wisdom without changing the over-all amount of the appropriation contained in this bill for construction in the Bureau of Reclamation that this particular transfer could be made to get these acres under construction and under irrigation?

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman has heard me say in the well of the House that any money that is spent on America cannot be wasted. I have that same belief and philosophy as I stand here now. But we also made an agreement in committee that we would not add any new construction money if the budget did

not see fit to ask for it. We do not think it is a new project. Next year they can come in and ask for funds. We have to keep our word with our committee as well as with the Congress and I do not want to turn around and ask to spend money to start on any new construction when we already have an ironclad agreement that we would not do so.

Mr. HOLMES. In the face of this emergency and in view of the fact that the chairman of your committee has sat in on the hearings on this particular project and the committee does not believe it a new project, would you not still think it wise to try to get this extension under way as quickly as possible, especially when it can be done so easily and readily by the transfer of these funds? It seems to me with the committee so ruling it not a new project that those funds could be authorized now for construction.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would try to get it in another body; not with a committee that already said they are not going to spend a dime on new construction.

Mr. HOLMES. What would be the purpose of trying to get it in another body when we have an opportunity to do it right here?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because the committee is objecting to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to this paragraph to reduce the figure on line 11, page 231. Is it necessary for me to offer it at this time as a substitute, or may I offer it after the disposition of the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. In reply to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will have to state that if the pending amendment is not adopted, the gentleman could then offer his amendment, but if the pending amendment is adopted, then it would not be in order to offer the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Then I offer the amendment at this time as a substitute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. The unanimous-consent request that was granted does not extend to others the opportunity to offer amendments to a paragraph that has not been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement it certainly would open the door for that to be done. Otherwise, Members who might want to increase the other amount would be prevented from doing it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was exactly why I raised the question I did at the time the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] offered his amendment. I am sure the RECORD will show that I raised that question at the time. It occurred to me that once this figure was changed, it could not subsequently be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asked the gentleman from Washington a question about

his amendment. The Chair did not reply to it. The gentleman from Washington made reply to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct. His reply was that it did not change the figure in the next paragraph.

Mr. HOLMES. I am sorry I must have misunderstood you. I said in the succeeding section and I understood you to say the next succeeding section.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Had he said it would change the figure in the next paragraph, I was contemplating raising the very question which has now come up.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Is this not the situation: If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] should be adopted, then no further amendment changing the figure in the paragraph beginning on line 8, page 231, would be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the amendment offered by Mr. HOLMES: On page 231, line 11, strike out "\$297,467,000" and insert "\$240,391,125."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in support of his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment at least has the merit of simplicity. I realize that it will probably be vigorously opposed. It does simply this: It reduces the amount for construction of reclamation projects 25 percent below the budget estimates; not below the amount in the bill, \$297,000,000, but below the budget estimate, \$320,000,000. It cuts \$80,000,000 from the budget figures, but only \$57,000,000 from the bill before us.

This omnibus bill contains reductions below the requests submitted by the Corps of Engineers for rivers and harbors and flood control projects amounting to 25 percent, but there was a reduction in the reclamation projects of only 7 percent. I see no reason for making any such distinction. There is nothing sacrosanct about the amounts allowed for the activities of either of these Government agencies. No doubt, every Member has one or more projects in his district which he would like to see advanced as quickly as possible. But it seems to me that if there was ever a time in the financial history of our Nation that we needed to view this problem with our minds focused on the over-all picture rather than on our own individual local problems, that time is now.

The continuation year after year of deficit financing and our plunge deeper and deeper into the sea of red ink presents to me an extremely disturbing picture. If this were happening to us in our own business or our own family, we would be lying awake nights worrying about how we could ever make ends meet. Ours is the responsibility to bend every conceivable effort to see that the Federal

cloth is cut to fit the pattern, which can mean only one thing, reductions all along the line, painful as they may be.

Specifically, if the financial condition of this country were different, it might be prudent to bring about equalization between the engineer projects and the reclamation projects by an across-the-board increase in the former. But certainly, in the face of our national debt of over a quarter of a trillion dollars—a new word on which Uncle Sam has an exclusive copyright—in the face of the added fact that we are confronted with the sobering realization that the tragic state of our finances is bound to be worse before it is better, it seems to me the prudent course for us is to make at least as great a reduction in the provision for reclamation projects as the Appropriations Committee has made in the civil functions bill on projects handled by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand that the gentleman's reduction will be applied as a 25 percent reduction straight across the board?

Mr. KEATING. I do not think I am in a position to decide that question. I notice that in the proposed reductions which are set forth on page 170 of the report the Interior Department has not done that to date; in other words, they have not made a 7 percent reduction across the board; they have reduced some projects more than 7 percent; they have left others just as they are. How they have determined where to cut and where not to cut is something that is entirely beyond my knowledge.

The result of the adoption of this amendment would be that 25 percent less than the budget estimates would be available for all phases of this particular activity.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The Missouri Valley item was reduced 10 percent; the rest of the item from this bill for reclamation was scarcely touched. I offered an amendment in the full committee to bring the rest of the items in line with the cut which was made for the Missouri Valley and was roundly whipped by the members of the opposition. But I want the gentleman to understand that I have possibly a better economy record than has the gentleman who has offered this amendment. I also want him to understand that I resent his taking upon himself the privilege of offering this amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. I am sorry that the gentleman feels as he does.

Mr. JENSEN. I say that because the gentleman knows exactly nothing about it.

Mr. KEATING. I refuse to yield further; I am very sorry.

Mr. JENSEN. And you are not running my business.

Mr. KEATING. I am very sorry the gentleman feels as he does.

Mr. JENSEN. I helped cut out of this bill \$47,000,000 in committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. And you are not running my committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. I may say to the gentleman from Iowa that I have the highest regard for him and the splendid record he has made for economy in this Congress. I appreciate all that he has done. I commend him for it. I realize that perhaps his interests or his views at times may not coincide with mine. I hope he will accord me the same sincerity of purpose which I am very happy to accord to him. I assure him that I am not trying to interfere with his fine service on this important committee. If his conscience dictates opposition to this amendment, that is his decision which I would be the last to criticize. I trust he will equally recognize my privilege to take the position that my sense of duty dictates.

I feel that it would be only fair to treat all projects on the same basis whatever their origin. That is the effect of my amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. But you are not doing it. You have taken 35 percent out of the Missouri Valley project. I have got around 100,000 acres of land out there right now lying under water because we have not had necessary flood-control funds, and now you are proposing to take 25 percent off the rest of them.

Mr. KEATING. My amendment is not directed to any particular project. It is an over-all figure of 25 percent and involves only the total figure contained in the budget estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7786) making appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DESIGNATION OF AMERICAN STUDENT NURSE DAYS, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of House Joint Resolution 455.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the nursing profession, which provides one of the vital health services of the Nation, there is a continuing shortage of registered professional nurses; and

Whereas in order to provide adequate numbers of graduate nurses in future years, 50,000 new students should be enrolled in schools of professional nursing in 1950: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That in order to emphasize the needs of hospitals and health services for additional nurses, and to direct attention to the satisfaction of careers in nursing and the opportunities for service to humanity within this profession, the 6th and 7th days of May 1950 be designated American Student Nurse Days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIUS ZAFFARENI — VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 581)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1481, a bill for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the estate of Julius Zaffareni, a Work Projects Administration employee, late of Boston, Mass., the sum of \$2,559.05. This payment would be in full settlement of all claims of the estate against the United States arising out of Mr. Zaffareni's death on November 16, 1939, when he was killed by a backing truck operated by another Work Projects Administration employee. The bill recites the fact that the same amount had been awarded as damages and costs to the estate by a Massachusetts State court on July 29, 1941, in a suit against the truck driver, and that this judgment remains unsatisfied because of the defendant's inability to pay. Under the terms of the bill, this sum would be payable only upon the assignment to the United States of all rights of the estate under such judgment.

It appears from the files of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, which administers the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, that when the fatal injuries were inflicted upon the decedent by the negligent act of his fellow employee, the decedent was in the performance of his duty, and that the case was therefore one cognizable under the Compensation Act. Under the terms of that act, however, compensation for death, except burial expenses, is payable only to certain classes of dependents specified in the act.

On June 15, 1940, a claim for compensation was filed on behalf of Sabina Loriso, who is said to be the only surviving sister and heir-at-law of the de-

cedent and is the administratrix of his estate. The claim could not be allowed, both because there was no showing that she was dependent for support upon the employee at the time of his death and because she was married, married brothers and sisters being excluded from benefits. It appears, however, that a burial payment of \$200 was made under the Compensation Act to the undertaking firm which had conducted the funeral of the decedent.

The report of the Senate Judiciary Committee—Senate Report No. 1459—indicates that the Congress based its action in passing this bill upon the judicial finding of negligence in the State court proceedings, and upon the premise that if the accident had occurred after the effective date of the Federal Tort Claims Act—January 1, 1945—the claimant could have sued and collected against the Government and that, therefore, to deny relief in this case would be an arbitrary avoidance of a just obligation.

It would seem, however, that in basing the bill on these premises the Congress overlooked the vital fact that the fatal injuries suffered by this Government employee occurred during the performance of his duties, and that the Congress has provided a carefully designed system of workmen's compensation to cover such injuries and deaths regardless of the question of negligence and has designated the classes of persons who should be beneficiaries and the conditions which they must meet in order to qualify as such. The basic principle of the United States Employees' Compensation Act in this respect was to provide compensation to those persons who were dependent upon the deceased and were deprived by his death of a means of support, not to accord a monetary award for grief or mental suffering or other damages for which compensation may be awarded in a State court proceeding.

The Congress also appears to have overlooked the recent enactment of Public Law 357, Eighty-first Congress, providing, in substance, that the liability of the United States to persons entitled to receive benefits under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall be exclusive and in lieu of any other liability to such persons under other applicable Federal statutes. While it is true that this limitation, which also applies with respect to most of the State workmen's compensation laws, was not a part of the Compensation Act at the time of this accident, such limitation was unnecessary since the Government could not then be sued in tort.

In my opinion, the Congress acted wisely in removing any cause for doubt as to the exclusiveness of the remedy afforded by this act to Federal personnel. In view of the blanket coverage which is provided by this legislation, it is reasonable to conclude that these employees have, by entering the Federal service, waived rights to which other persons not so employed are entitled. They have, in other words, relinquished any right of action against the United States which might accrue to them as a result of injury or death sustained

during the course of Federal employment, in exchange for the assured and orderly protection, independent of the question of fault or negligence, which the Federal Employees' Compensation Act affords not only to such employees but also to their surviving dependents in case of death. This view is supported by the legislative history of Public Law 357, Eighty-first Congress.

No sound reason is perceived why, under similar circumstances, the foregoing principle should not apply to the legislative as well as the judicial process.

Accordingly, I have withheld my approval from this bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 3, 1950.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and the accompanying message will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

HOURLY OF MEETING

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m., and that when the House adjourns on tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Friday at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are some committees of this House that have very important matters before them. When the House convenes at 11 o'clock every day it simply means that these committees cannot get their work done. I certainly do not like to put myself in the position of going against the will of the leadership, but I know that our committee has had very little time in which to do the job we have to do. If we are going to meet at 11 o'clock every day it will probably be a very long time before we get any tax measure out of the committee, and I know the membership of this House is very much concerned about the long time it has taken to get that bill out. I am wondering whether or not some arrangement could not be made so that this appropriation measure would not stifle all other important legislation at this session of the Congress. It seems that this one-package appropriation bill has upset the procedure that has been in existence in this House for many, many years, and I think it is a detriment to the enactment of legislation which we could properly class as "must" legislation. I seriously doubt whether this unanimous-consent request should be granted, but not having talked the matter over with the leadership at this time, I will not object. I hope, however, that he confines his request to tomorrow only, though.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, after conferring with my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], I was going to confine my unanimous consent request to tomorrow. Of course, my friend from Pennsylvania realizes, as one of the responsible leaders of the House, being a democratic member of the Committee on

Ways and Means, that the leadership knows that he always cooperates, and I compliment the gentleman. Of course, we are not meeting every day at 11 o'clock, and the leadership would not do this unless there were urgent reasons. We have to consider a certain number of reorganization plans under the law, and the leadership is under a trying situation. We have certain responsibilities to carry out, and we have got to get these reorganization plans up on or before May 23, and it is imperative that we do so because the law provides for it. The leadership, I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania will admit, is very tolerant and understanding.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations, by having priority on this so-called one package appropriation bill, has practically taken over the leadership of the House insofar as legislation is concerned. We are not able to consider any legislation unless we have the consent of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and that has been true for the past 3 weeks and probably will be true for the next 2 or 3 weeks. I want to call attention to that fact so that the leadership is not taken away from the Speaker and the majority leader, in cooperation with the minority leader. I do not want the leadership taken away from those three gentlemen.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that, but I assure my friend that that is not so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Further reserving the right to object, the majority leader will admit that he is not able to bring in legislation unless the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations gives up his priority insofar as that bill is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, with the appropriation bill up, there would be no other legislation that would be brought up anyway.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And there never will be if we meet at 11 o'clock every morning. We met one week practically every day at 11 o'clock and as the result the committees could not work, unless they sneaked away in the afternoon, and as a result we are not here on the floor to vote on amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, unfortunately I have business in the interest of my constituents tomorrow morning, and I cannot be here at 11. Being all alone here, being neither a member of the Republican Party nor the Democratic Party, I have got to look out for myself and my constituents. So, therefore, I object.

AMENDMENT OF THE HATCH ACT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House

conferees on the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on that bill. I may say that the probabilities are that this conference report will be considered the first thing tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

OHIO SWISS CHEESE

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 1950, my friend, Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH of Wisconsin, inserted an article entitled "Monroe Issues Challenge" in the RECORD. The good citizens of Monroe were enraged over the criticism given of Wisconsin Swiss cheese by Bill Jones in the Minneapolis-Tribune in which he claimed that Ohio Swiss cheese was far better than that made in Wisconsin. Last week, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] challenged me to a "taste test" between Wisconsin and Ohio cheese. This test is to be made in the House dining room on Friday, May 19. As representative of the Sixteenth District of Ohio, composed of Holmes, Stark, and Tuscarawas Counties, where almost all of the 32 Ohio Swiss cheese plants are located, and on behalf of the Ohio Swiss Cheese Association and its members, I proudly accept the challenge made by my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, with full faith that the distinctive flavor of Ohio Swiss will whet the appetite of my colleagues here assembled and cause them to vote unanimously in favor of our product.

The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association has sent to me a wheel of its cheese. This wheel was made by Mr. John Schneider, of the Ragersville Dairy and his assistant, Mr. Carlos Meeks. I believe that you Members will be interested in the story of Ohio Swiss cheese manufacture. Sugarcreek, situated about 12 miles west of New Philadelphia, is the Swiss cheese capital of Ohio and compares in that position with Monroe, Wis. There are a total of 32 cheese factories in Ohio as of April 1950, with 8 factories within a 9-mile radius of Sugarcreek. The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association has as members 27 of these 32 factories. Three of the remaining 5 produce cheese full time, while the other 2 make cheese only during the surplus milk months in the summer. Ohio, at the present time, ranks third in Swiss cheese production and makes approximately one-tenth of the Nation's total production. At one time, Ohio was second but recently has lost out to Illinois. Wisconsin is in first place. The amount produced by each State in 1948 is as follows: Wisconsin, 43,192,000 pounds; Illinois, 10,372,000 pounds, and Ohio, 7,000,000 pounds. The total United States production is 70,665,000 pounds. There are only three Swiss cheese factories east of Ohio, all of them in

Pennsylvania. In Ohio, Tuscarawas County is generally considered the focal point of the industry, but Holmes County has 11 factories to Tuscarawas County's 9. Swiss cheese making in Ohio is confined entirely to Tuscarawas, Holmes, Wayne, Stark, and Coshocton Counties.

As can be seen from the production records, Ohio can never compete with Wisconsin in quantity; but quality and flavor are two other things. It is generally felt in Ohio and by men who know both States well, that Swiss cheese produced in Ohio is in general a higher quality product than that produced in Wisconsin and in Illinois. Ohio cheese is not, however, sold in as many places as Wisconsin cheese because of the large demand for Ohio cheese in its home State. Among the largest retail outlets for Ohio Swiss are Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati and points serviced by these cities; Pittsburgh, Erie, Indianapolis, Philadelphia, New York City, and Toledo are some of the other cities that use a large amount of Ohio Swiss. There are, of course, many other large Ohio cities that use a lot of our local product. The first Swiss cheese factory was started in Ohio more than 75 years ago when immigrants from Switzerland arrived in Tuscarawas County. The hills of Tuscarawas County are said to have closely resembled their homeland as any section of America they had seen. Originally all of the cheese makers were born in Switzerland but there are now some second generation and even some who have only indirect Swiss ancestry. However, most of the cheese makers are still "Swiss."

The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association was organized in 1918 to improve the quality and selling conditions for Ohio cheese. Each December the Association holds a "Cheese Day" meeting at which the best cheese maker of the year is selected. Other contests between Ohio producers are held annually at county fairs held at Wooster and Dover and at the Ohio State Fair. In 1940 a few factories set up another association known as the Federated Ohio Swiss Cheese Producers. The Ohio Swiss Cheese Association along with the State and Federal Government, has a full-time technician at work aiding factories in problems they may encounter in manufacture. At the present time the technician is Fred Ryser. He operates a modern laboratory in Sugarcreek and visits the various member factories regularly. Most of the Ohio factories are cooperatively owned by farmers who supply the cheese maker with milk. Only six plants are privately owned, in most cases by the cheese maker himself.

On behalf of the Ohio Swiss Cheese Association, its member dairies and all the Ohio cheese makers and the people of the Sixteenth Ohio District, I proudly accept the challenge laid down by my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I now wish to invite you all to try our Ohio Swiss which will be served in the House dining room on Friday, May 19. I leave final judgment to you, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, whether the flavor of Ohio Swiss is better than that of Wisconsin.

FORMER OFFICER ASKS MILITARY JUSTICE BILL VETO

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been directed to an article that appeared in the Evening Star of May 2, wherein Capt. Robert B. Ritchie, who served for a considerable period in the Judge Advocate General Corps in Germany, has requested the President to veto a military-justice bill that was recently approved by the House and Senate, the bill being H. R. 4080.

In order to get this matter before the House, I am asking unanimous consent that I may include the newspaper article, also a copy of the letter directed to the President of the United States, wherein Captain Ritchie calls attention to what he believes to be defects in this bill. He points out that in his judgment the legislation does not reach the objective intended by the Congress. The newspaper article and letter follow:

FORMER OFFICER ASKS MILITARY-JUSTICE BILL VETO

A former Army legal officer asked President Truman today to veto the military justice bill so that several vicious features of the measure might be corrected by Congress.

Capt. Robert B. Ritchie, who served in the Judge Advocate General Corps in Berlin until leaving the service on March 31, wrote the President that the bill passed last week falls short of its aim to improve the military court-martial system.

Congress, he declared, was on the right track in trying to lessen the power of the chain of military command over courts martial. It made headway in efforts to eliminate the danger of improper influence by high-ranking officers in appointments and deliberations, he said.

But the provision for a civilian court of appeals and the over-all section specifying penalties for violation of the general act would not provide sufficient safeguards, Captain Ritchie declared.

"The Judge Advocate General," he explained, "has the authority to increase the work load of the court at will by ordering cases sent to it. Thus he can influence the court by harassing it; or if the court should not have enough business, he can influence it by throwing it enough work to justify its existence."

"None of these influences would exist if the Judge Advocate was required to go to the court by certiorari."

Captain Ritchie, who lives in Wichita, Kans., said a more serious defect in the bill is that it would take away from the Army and Air Force personnel the long-standing right to demand trial. Under the present system, in many cases, they may agree to accept nonjudicial punishment, or may insist on a court martial.

WICHITA, KANS., April 28, 1950.

The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: After my separation from the Army March 31 as a captain in the Judge Advocate General Corps I completed my study of H. R. 4080, now before you for veto consideration, and submitted my analysis of its defects to a Member of Congress with the hope that if the bill passed

without substantial change, amendments necessary to make it carry out the congressional intent would be affected. Unfortunately this effort was unsuccessful. I now submit in abbreviated form the mentioned defects to you for consideration:

1. Congress, rather than establish an independent judicial system for the armed services, which it thought was desirable but impractical, formulated, to overcome improper domination of courts martial, two devices. These were article 98, thought to make it a penalty to violate article 37, prohibiting unlawful influencing of court members, and article 67, believed to establish a civilian-composed Court of Military Appeals free from the possibility of military control or influence. Neither device performs its intended function, because—

(a) Article 37 is not a provision regulating the proceedings before, during, or after trial of an accused.

(b) The Judge Advocate General has the authority to increase the work load of the court at will by ordering cases sent to it. Thus he can influence the court by harassing it, or if the court should not have enough business, as may happen, he can influence it by doing it the favor of throwing it enough work to justify its existence. Neither of these influences would exist, if the Judge Advocate General was required to go to the court by certiorari, the method in all cases except those involving high-ranking officers and death penalties.

2. Following are three other vicious features of the bill:

(a) Article 15 takes away from Army and Air Force personnel the law prescribed protection of the right to demand trial rather than to submit to nonjudicial punishment because the Navy felt it could not maintain discipline aboard ship unless it had the right to confine a man on bread and water without trial. This right is unnecessary if it understands and uses properly the judicial punishment system.

(b) Articles 3 and 43, when combined, would permit many individuals formerly subject to military law to be brought back into the service and tried for practically any offense at any time during their natural life, because all offenses are punishable by at least life imprisonment—"as a court martial may direct"—and the statute of limitations may be tolled by filing charges in a nonpublic office.

Since the defects pointed out above result probably from a failure to consider details, and since they can be easily corrected, I recommend to you, Mr. President, that the bill be vetoed.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT BOWLAND RITCHIE.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from Liberty magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, in addressing the Members of the House today on what in my opinion is one of the most important problems facing our country today, it is my earnest desire to call to their attention a piece of legislation that will do much to rectify a very serious condition. The bill I refer to is H. R. 5939, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman Tom BURKE, and known as the teachers' salary bill. It provides for Federal assistance in such a manner that it in nowise could be

considered controversial or discriminatory except by those who might be opposed to providing a better education for the children of our Nation through Federal aid.

For those Members who perhaps have not had the opportunity to become familiar with the critical situation now existing in this field I recommend and solicit their reading of the following article which appeared in the May issue of Liberty magazine which I intend to include at the conclusion of my remarks. We of the House Committee on Education and Labor who have been working so diligently on this subject know of the great need for this legislation as well as the serious need for assistance for other phases of this broad problem. Yesterday I called your attention to some of those in the extension of my remarks on pages A3211 and A3212 of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

While I appreciate that the subcommittee of which I am a member has been working continuously for many weeks drafting and perfecting the necessarily complex bills 7940 and 8113 which deal with a small but very important portion of this over-all problem and which are now practically ready for the full committee's consideration and action, I urge the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], the chairman of this great committee, along with the chairman of its various subcommittees to postpone any conflicting meetings or any others that might interfere with immediate and full consideration of and with the definite view in mind of getting these vitally needed pieces of legislation—H. R. 7940, 8113, and 5939—to the floor of the House for speedy passage.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not my intention or wish to create the erroneous impression that these gentlemen have not in every way given full cooperation along with much of their valuable time. However, I feel that more encouragement to all of us to work harder, giving our full attention to these specific bills, would be of great value.

I am sure that the President is very much in favor of such a program as I have outlined and I cannot too strongly urge your full support. I have been deeply interested in the proposition that all of our children whom we must realize are our future citizens and leaders be given an opportunity for good educations. Also that those giving their lives to the teaching of these children be treated fairly and equitably so that they may live and enjoy a life more nearly commensurate with their worth to our society.

In a democracy it is essential that our youth get the kind of education that will prepare them for responsible citizenship. The American way of life will grow and flourish only as we maintain a strong system of education.

[From Liberty magazine]

WE ARE STARVING OUR TEACHERS

(By Benjamin Fine)

(America's future depends on the schooling our children get today. Yet we pay schoolteachers less than rat exterminators; less than charwomen and garbage collectors.

In this article Liberty presents the shocking truth about teachers' salaries.)

Let's begin by being brutally frank about it.

We are starving our teaching profession. We aren't paying our teachers a living wage.

Our teachers' low salaries have become a national disgrace. We are weakening our democratic way of life because we are unwilling to pay our teachers enough to make them want to teach. Hundreds of thousands of them are constantly in debt, trying to make ends meet. Many communities pay their garbage collectors more than their teachers. It is not unusual to find the street cleaners, prison cooks, dog catchers, and comfort-station attendants getting more than teachers. Policemen, firemen, bus drivers, and other city workers are financial aristocrats compared to classroom instructors.

The average teacher today gets \$2,880 a year—just about \$55 a week. That sounds like a lot of money compared to her prewar salary. But inflationary costs have cut into her purchasing power. The \$55 of 1950 is not worth as much as \$40 was in 1940.

Two hundred thousand teachers in the United States make less than \$35 a week now. Half this number get less than \$30. Some teachers get as little as \$10 a week. Could you hire a dog catcher for that salary?

Here are some painful facts to mull over: Three out of every four teachers in Mississippi get less than \$30 a week. One out of every two gets less than that in Kentucky, Arkansas, Georgia, and North Dakota. In 10 States—Arkansas, Georgia, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, and South Carolina—one out of every two teachers gets less than \$35 a week.

But that isn't all. In a survey I made for the New York Times not long ago, I found that the minimum wages paid teachers are fantastically small. For example, some teachers are getting as little as \$450 a year in Nebraska, \$500 in Mississippi, \$524 in Kentucky, \$696 in Tennessee, \$700 in Arkansas, and \$900 in Alabama.

With the cost of eggs, butter, meat, and coffee being what it is, how can you live on \$450 a year (\$8.65 a week) or even \$500 (\$9.62 a week)?

"I can't hire a decent janitor for that," a school superintendent said plaintively. "How can I get a teacher to work at starvation wages?"

It just doesn't make sense.

Here's a letter that a teacher wrote his county superintendent.

"DEAR SIR: I don't think I'll teach any more. I'm now earning \$8.25 weekly. I can't get married on that. I reckon I'll go to work on the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad. They pay section hands \$7 a day.

"If you can pay more, write me. I like to teach. If not, I'll be over Tuesday with the books and blackboard."

The implications are startling. From 8 to 12 years of their formative period our children are in constant contact with their teachers. No one in our community—not even bus drivers, policemen, or firemen—plays such an important role in molding the minds of youth. The shape our country will be in tomorrow depends upon the schooling our kids get today.

I spoke to the chairman of the board of education in a small town not long ago. "What do you pay your teachers?" I asked. He called in the business manager and was informed it was \$25 a week.

"Why, that's impossible!" he exclaimed. "My office boy gets more than that!"

Teachers get less money than members of any other recognized profession. They are far below, in average earnings, members of the medical, dental, engineering, and law professions. They make less than the aver-

age newspaperman does, or the average truck driver. Oftentimes they make less than unskilled laborers; they rarely make as much as a carpenter, plumber, electrician, or bricklayer.

In 1948, for example, the average net remuneration in medicine was \$11,300; and for civil engineers in private industry, \$9,000. Dentists earned \$7,039. The teacher's average salary in the United States for 1948 was \$2,500, or less than a fourth of that of the medical profession. In 1943 all manufacturing employees earned an average of \$3,040, compared with about \$2,500 for teachers.

In New York City, building construction workers get more than \$5,000 a year. Teachers start at \$2,500, and reach \$5,000, if they are lucky, after 15 years of service.

Maybe that is why most of the 75,000 teachers in New York State—where salaries are among the highest in the country—have to work on the side to supplement their income. Just listen: One man sold cemetery lots to pay his bills. Another took a job in a hotel scrubbing floors. Teachers hold all kinds of part-time jobs: truck drivers, welders, shoe salesmen, florists, ticket sellers, real-estate salesmen, carpenters, milkmen, waiters, cooks, barbers, and chambermaids. Sixty former teachers in Chicago took jobs as waitresses or dice-game girls—and earned from \$36 to \$70 a week, plus meals.

Perhaps it's not bad to work in your spare time, but what about your professional growth? You just don't have time to serve as a barber from 6 to 12, as one teacher did, if you're in the classroom from 9 to 3, and expect to keep up with modern-teaching methods.

If your salary for teaching is \$60 a month, and school is open only 6 months of the year, you may find it tough living on \$360 for 12 months. Maybe you, too, would feel puzzled, as did the country school teacher in Copiah County, Mississippi.

"What do you do the rest of the time when you are not teaching?" the Mississippi miss was asked.

"The last four summers I worked, beginning the last of March until June, at a factory," she replied. "We made containers for vegetables."

After a moment's pause she said wryly, "I make more in 1 week in the factory than I make in a month teaching."

The obvious question comes to mind: Why does she continue to teach?

"Teaching is my profession," she replied with dignity. "I would rather teach than do anything else."

When a teacher earns more making vegetable containers than she does teaching children, just what is her profession anyway? Is she a teacher or a vegetable-container maker? Not long ago a teacher in West Virginia, earning \$178 a month—not enough to keep himself and family in food and clothes—was suspended for digging coal on the side. He made \$320 a month for his part-time job. And when a Brooklyn war veteran, getting \$50 a week for teaching, found that he needed the \$60 a week he made as a bartender in the evening hours, his social status, and even his job, was endangered. But what about the Tennessee school principal who worked Saturdays as a grocery clerk, or the teacher who hired himself out as a cotton picker? Can they carry full-time jobs on the side and still expect to be good teachers?

A Buffalo teacher gave a frank answer. After 30 years in the profession, he can't support his wife and two children on the \$50 he takes home weekly.

"I make more selling vacuum cleaners than I do teaching," he confessed, "but my teaching suffers."

When we pay shoe salesmen and charwomen more than we do our teachers, we are not getting the best brains for our chil-

dren. Our schools are the very cornerstone of our democracy. Let's not chip away at the corners.

A Nation-wide survey conducted by Liberty shows the vast gap that exists between salaries paid to teachers and those paid to other city employees. In virtually every one of the Nation's largest cities, rookie policemen, firemen, as well as transit workers and garbage collectors, get a higher beginning salary than do teachers.

Now, it may well be that our large cities couldn't get along without policemen, firemen, transit workers, and garbage collectors. But can we get along without adequately trained teachers? Unless we are willing to pay teachers at least as much as we do garbage collectors, we can't expect to get our best youth to enter the teaching profession.

Here are beginning salaries for policemen, firemen, transit workers, garbage collectors, and teachers in 15 of our largest cities—a shameful eye-opener for all of us:

City	Policemen	Firemen	Transit workers	Garbage collectors	Teachers
New York.....	\$3,150	\$3,150	\$2,979	\$3,250	\$2,500
Chicago.....	3,012	3,012	3,224	2,756	2,500
Philadelphia.....	4,024	2,944	3,692	2,643	2,400
Detroit.....	3,257	3,257	4,400	3,037	3,046
Cleveland.....	2,748	2,640	3,600	3,070	2,700
Baltimore.....	2,600	2,700	3,619	2,845	2,600
St. Louis.....	3,144	3,144	2,240	2,580	2,400
Boston.....	2,800	2,800	3,120	2,613	2,484
Pittsburgh.....	2,979	2,979	3,224	2,912	2,200
San Francisco.....	3,420	3,420	3,759	4,368	2,700
Minneapolis.....	3,036	3,036	3,162	3,016	2,400
Houston, Tex.....	2,700	2,700	3,772	2,496	2,403
Seattle.....	3,120	3,120	3,390	3,575	2,600
Louisville, Ky.....	2,400	2,400	3,350	2,600	2,400
Milwaukee.....	3,300	3,300	3,500	3,096	2,807
Average.....	2,983	2,977	3,400	2,990	2,609

What a grave indictment. Virtually every one of our largest cities pay policemen, firemen, transit workers, and garbage collectors more than teachers. The entering teacher gets, in our largest cities, an average salary of \$2,609. But the garbage collector can count on \$2,990.

Of course, through annual increments of \$100 to \$150 a year, the teachers' salaries frequently pull away from the collectors of garbage. But it takes long years of preparation to be a teacher. In each of the cities reached by Liberty, the teacher is required to have at least a 4-year college education before she gets her certificate. It is doubtful whether that is expected of garbage collectors or even the higher-paid bus or subway drivers.

If teachers' salaries are so out of line in the large cities, what about the small rural communities, or the cities and towns below 25,000 population? Here we find the salaries even more pitifully inadequate. To quote but a few instances: Teachers in Stuttgart, Ark., get \$1,230 a year; in Madisonville, Ky., \$1,329; Van Buren, Maine, \$1,631; Aberdeen, Miss., \$1,080; and Ripley, Tenn., \$1,427.

How can a teacher live on \$20 or \$25 a week and expect to keep up with modern educational practices, dress well, and serve as a model to the youth of the community? Does it make sense that tens of thousands of teachers get paid less than garbage collectors and rat exterminators?

Maybe that is why the superintendent in a Georgia rural-school system got this puzzling letter of complaint from one of his teachers: "Dear Sir: When I since [signed?] up Wednesday I was to since up for four check and I just since up for two check and that made four time for me too. If this don't go to the write place send it on to the one to—and since you up. Ever two week. I don't you to since me my other checks to me be—

cause the money is hard to made for me not to get them so sense them out to me at once.

"P. S.—Answer real soon."

The disturbed board officials finally puzzled out what the teacher meant: She had received only two checks in 4 months. Dr. John I. Allman, Georgia's deputy State superintendent of schools, pronto sent her the missing two checks. Perhaps she could continue to teach reading and arithmetic, but could she be entrusted to teach writing to the young trustful souls under her care?

"We have no control over her," explained Dr. Allman. Then he added wistfully, "Perhaps she is the best they can get for \$67.50 a month."

If we pay a teacher \$15 or \$16 a week we'll get our money's worth all right. It's a wonder the Georgia teacher could write at all.

I have seen teachers who couldn't. Not far from Detroit I met a \$35-a-week teacher who boasted of the lacing he gave one of his students: "He won't get out of bed for a week." And then he added, "If I can't larn 'em, I wham 'em." Or how would you like your child to be taught by the female ancient mariner come to life who told her pupils in a Rocky Mountain State, "Wait till the women get the right to vote in this country. We'll show the men how to run it."

The present salaries cannot possibly bring the best minds into the teaching profession. When a college graduate can enter business, industry, or the Government at a higher salary than he can the teaching profession, why shouldn't he take the better-paying job? A recent study shows that teachers are the lowest paid among the Colgate graduates, while those in industry are the highest. Teachers in the class of 1928 averaged \$4,105, while men in industry made \$12,510 annually. Graduates of the class of 1938 showed a similar disparity: Those who graduated 12 years ago and went into industry are now making \$6,144 each; those who went into teaching are making \$3,513. It has been estimated that a teacher has 1 chance in 2,500 to earn \$10,000 or more a year, and 1 chance in 400 to earn \$7,500 or more.

Indeed, New York, the richest State in the Union, illustrates the disparity that exists between salaries paid to teachers and those received by other professions. This table shows the entering annual salaries of several groups:

Engineer, \$2,898.
Economist, \$2,898.
Statistician, \$3,036.
Architect, \$3,450.
Insurance examiner, \$3,846.
Bank examiner, \$4,242.
Physician, \$4,636.
Teacher, \$2,500 (\$2,700 with M. A. degree).

Again we find the teacher on the lowest rung of the financial ladder.

A survey of 169 well-known industrial concerns by the Northwestern University's bureau of placement estimates that the average salaries for college graduates this year will be \$245 a month. Beginning engineers will get \$260; sales personnel, \$240; accountants, \$238; general business trainees, \$234; and those in other fields, \$252. Teachers will get \$185 a month.

Alarmed at this trend, the High School Teachers Association of New York City warned: "Teachers who are forced to pinch pennies to maintain a decent professional standard of living certainly will not be enthusiastic about recommending the teaching profession to capable young people."

Perhaps that is why one-third of all the teachers of the Nation said, in answer to a questionnaire: "I would not recommend that my bright students go into teaching." Or why one mother said bitterly, "I'd break my son's neck if he decided to become a teacher. It's bad enough that his dad is in this racket."

The low teaching salary is the most important reason for the growing teacher crisis. This year our teaching training institutions will prepare less than 20,000 elementary school teachers. We will need 100,000. During the next 10 years the Nation will need 1,000,000 teachers—and will have one-fifth that number available. How can you expect the bright students to go into teaching if they can start at a higher salary in almost any other profession?

During the war and postwar years 350,000 teachers, many of them the best in the profession, deserted the classroom for better-paying jobs. Sometimes a small rural school may have five or six teachers come and go in 1 year. Of course, some teachers stick because of loyalty to their students and because they love teaching. A southern teacher with 14 years' experience, now getting \$886 a year, gave this reason for remaining on the job:

"I enjoy working with children and feel that I am making a worth-while contribution to my community. Otherwise I would have left the teaching profession long ago."

Only recently the southern schoolma'am said she was offered a position as a maid for an elderly lady which would have paid her considerably more than she's now getting as a teacher. She didn't quit although, in her own words, "Almost any position I might get as waitress, cook, factory worker, or beauty-parlor assistant would pay me more money than I am now making teaching school."

Listen to the testimony of Mrs. Marie R. Turner, superintendent of Breathitt County schools, Jackson, Ky., who appeared before the House Education Committee last June, where she testified in behalf of Federal aid for schools:

"We are able to pay our best-qualified teachers—on a 12-month basis—\$118 a month. Our least-qualified teachers earn \$70 a month. As a result we are not holding our more capable teachers, nor are we attracting new material of the best caliber."

This is a real problem. Until we pay teachers as much as we pay others for less important jobs, we'll not get competent teachers.

Everywhere the story is the same: The American teacher is being sold short. She is not getting enough to attract our best brains. If we cheat our teachers, we cheat our children too. Then society is the loser.

In a democracy it is essential that our youth get the kind of education that will prepare them for responsible citizenship. The American way of life will grow and flourish only as we maintain a strong system of education. Underpaid teachers will mean undereducated boys and girls. As the richest Nation in the world we can afford to pay our teachers a decent living wage. Let's throw away our peanuts attitude, and encourage the best among our citizens to become teachers.

Without good teachers we will not have good schools. And without good schools our democracy is endangered.

THE SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

GLOOMY OBSERVANCE

MR. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, today, wherever there beats a Polish heart, we can be sure it is more keenly attuned to the ever-present thought of liberty because May 3 marks the anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution 159 years ago. It is Poland's national holiday and to exiled Poles scattered over the globe it is a day dedicated to undiminishing hope in the ultimate

attainment of freedom for a long-suffering fatherland.

One of the greatest documents in world history, the Polish Constitution burst upon the scene in Europe in the midst of enemies who were determined to suppress this courageous and liberal venture in self-government. It was, at that time, the brightest shaft of light to penetrate the deep darkness of a continent bogged down by inequalities, serfdom and rule by the privileged class. But the forces in opposition saw to it that this exemplary and revolutionary document did not receive an opportunity of being exercised to their detriment. Soon after the unholy partnership, Russia, Germany, and Austria dismembered and plunged Poland into a period of subjugation that lasted 150 years and terminated after World War I in the achievement of independence.

What joy and hope and enthusiasm a nation reborn can know after a century and a half of slavery can scarcely be visualized. Peace and independence attained, Poland looked forward with confidence in the future and with the honest expectation that the worst of its unhappy history was a thing of the past. That this was to be but an interim, brief, elusive and fleeting as a dream, none could believe. Yet an aspirant to world domination with the first blitzkrieg descended upon Poland with full fury and ended the beautiful dream by aerial and artillery shelling that struck down men, women, and children in methodical destruction aimed at eliminating for all time a nation that had scarcely sufficient time to catch its breath and to rise to its feet after 150 years of abuse at the hands of three ruthless tyrants.

The Hitler horde pressed through in its brutal attack and gained its objective for the time. But, worse yet was the agreement Germany made with Russia to partition Poland. Engulfed, deserted, alone, and helpless, this courageous peace-loving nation was faced with extermination. It must be remembered that the promised assistance never materialized. When at long last the Nazi juggernaut had been repelled, a spark of hope was rekindled that perhaps the independence that was so criminally interrupted might again be restored. And, in spite of the terrific cost, the winning of freedom seemed to be worth the price. The word of the Allies was the guaranty upon which was placed unlimited faith despite all the cruel adversities and the indescribable suffering experienced. This then was the child-like faith of the Polish people. Patience and trust and belief in the ultimate resurrection of its country with the help of the United States prevailed in Poland and throughout the world wherever there exists sympathy for this most harassed of nations.

Though May 3 is here again and the world over Polish people turn their thoughts to that glorious, freedom-giving document, the Constitution of 1791, there is little cause for rejoicing, for there is no Poland where there is no freedom. In its place there is Communist brutality, aided and abetted by the grievous errors of the Yalta agreement. The

present government in Poland is the direct result of a sell-out by pro-Communist elements in our Government that guided the foreign policy of the United States at the time the infamous secret agreements were consummated. Our current programs of foreign relations are still slanted in that direction and the authors of these volatile policies wield their influence yet to the detriment of world peace.

And the pledges to Poland lie forgotten.

History can do nothing other than to saddle the United States with the accusation that it eliminated one enemy of Poland and invited another to take its place. This truth will become increasingly prominent as the Russian bear with its grasping, clawing paws reaches out to embrace more and more territory. Nations are falling before the military and diplomatic onslaughts of the Communists and are being absorbed into the Russian orbit the while we piddle away valuable time and condone an utterly irresponsible foreign policy that is fast leading the world toward that dreaded peace crusher—war. It must be admitted by even the most naive that Russia is extremely busy on all fronts, the diplomatic, the economic, and the military. She wastes no time but exploits every opportunity to advance her projects of eventual world domination.

The same old dream of world conquerors is shared by Joe Stalin and one would have to be stone deaf and black blind not to recognize that this ominous dream is being transformed, at this moment, into a cold, frightening and destructive reality by the Kremlin boss. Who can claim, in all honesty, that the present role of Communist Russia does not follow the time-worn pattern of subjugation. I have no patience with apologists who insist the United States does not understand Russia. What is there left to understand in the barbaric and shameless conduct of Soviet Russia whose brazen reluctance toward achievement of world peace is convincingly indicated each and every day. While we accept almost meekly the endless diplomatic and cold war shenanigans of the Kremlin our foreign policy remains sleazy, disintegrated and exposed to lampooning.

We have international responsibilities. That cannot be denied. They are serious, we all know. But we must meet the gravest of our problems—head on. Not with a chip on our shoulders. Not with any implied threats, but with realistic firmness that shall inspire a sound declaration of policy based on well-known concepts of righteousness. There are no alternate avenues by which we can reach a solution. Right is right and the mistakes made by our Red-tinted policymakers can be rectified.

I call for an unqualified repudiation of the Yalta agreement.

I entreat that a beginning be made, here and now, to pull down that wall of iron that keeps our tried and true ally, Poland, imprisoned behind it. If peace is truly the aim of Russia, then the release of Poland from its clutching grasp would entail no difficulty whatever, would clear the atmosphere of world sus-

picion and prepare the path to peace. I address myself to the Russian nation and invite its attention to this fundamental truth.

Peace is simple to achieve. Peace is possible if it is truly desired.

A start toward that goal can be made in Poland. Withdrawal of Russian forces and restoration of Polish independence would be acclaimed by the world at large. That is a clear and perfectly obvious assignment of Soviet Russia in the present cold war that is rapidly warming up to a dangerous degree. The duty of the United States in this instance is to remember the pledges made to heroic Poland, devout believer in the principles of freedom and constitutional government, and friend and ally.

The valiant people of Poland look to this country for encouragement and support in the hope that through the efforts of the United States the next observance of Polish Constitution Day will be an occasion for rejoicing in a free, happy, and prosperous country.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I wish to join the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut in his tribute today to the liberty-loving people of Poland. I hope that the Voice of America carries a complete account of his address today to those people behind the iron curtain.

Mr. SADLAK. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] has expired.

THE THIRD OF MAY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on this one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution—known simply by its date: The 3d of May—let us once again pause and pay tribute to that once-great nation, and reflect on its present-day tragedy.

To all Americans of Polish ancestry, and to the millions of Poles scattered throughout the continents of the world, this anniversary will always remain full of special significance. In all walks of life, in all fields of endeavor, in all conditions, they will always find inspiration and example in their forefathers' achievements and spirit, of which the Constitution of the Third of May 1791, is a worthy embodiment.

While sanguinary revolutions and upsets were marking the history of other nations through the eventful years of the eighteenth century, the Poles have peacefully and joyfully set themselves to the task of writing and adopting their great constitution, which gave to the common man of Poland the freedoms inherent in democracy. The manner in which this democratic document was born, though astounding to the rest of

the world, was merely in keeping with the tradition of the Poles who, from the earliest times, have shown deep respect for the dignity of man, and unwavering devotion to parliamentary principles.

It is well known that this enfranchisement of the Polish masses came too late to be enjoyed by them. Within a few years the third partition dismembered the old Republic, and for over a century it ceased to exist as a free nation. Yet this same spirit which motivated the adoption of the Constitution of the 3d of May, and which shaped the current of events of Poland's history, once again asserted itself as Poland gained freedom and independence in 1918.

The hour of freedom was brief. Torn between the rivalries of the East and the West, the totalitarian ambitions of her neighbors, Poland was once again dismembered, this time by the Nazis, whose reign of terror was soon to be replaced by the tragic Communist domination.

As we recall the history of Poland, and ponder over her present plight, we must ask ourselves, "How long must her people suffer?" And we must also ask ourselves, "How long must the other people suffer—the other people who also love freedom and independence, democracy and peace, and who, because of the rapacious actions of their neighbors, have already suffered so much?"

The end must come to the incessant warfare, to the oppression of the smaller nations, to bloodshed and pain, to intolerance and insatiable greed that have frustrated all the attempts at establishing peace and freedom in the world, and have brought tragedy to the lives of countless millions.

Our Nation has been, and is, working for the achievement of that goal—the thought of Poland must spur us in our efforts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I join with the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and also the other gentlemen who have spoken on this occasion in paying honor to the great people of Poland and in properly commemorating the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the establishment of the Polish Constitution. Every student of history is aware of the great contribution made toward the progress of mankind, toward the existence of the dignity of man and of the establishment of democratic institutions of government by the people of Poland in past generations. Every student of government is well aware of the deep faith that the people have always possessed, which has been an inspiration and a strength and a guidance to them in making their great contribution to the progress of man.

The people of Poland have been through many trying periods, but they have never been defeated. The people of Poland today are undergoing another period of pain, but the great courage, as a result of the faith that the people of Poland possess, will have them emerge from this period of pain and again enjoy their independence as a nation and their

freedom as a people. Persons of all races and of all racial origins are looking forward to the day when the heel of the oppressor, the vicious dictator, is removed from the soil and the people of Poland. Once that is done the alien regime that is in there now will be very quickly hurled out and again a government "of the people, by the people, for the people," as the great Abraham Lincoln well said so many years ago, will exist in that great land abroad.

May I say to the gentlemen who have made remarks today, some of whom are Americans of Polish descent, like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK], that the people of America are proud of the Americans of Polish blood and of the contribution they have made to the progress of our country. They have always been liberty-loving people, and they always will be, and with the help of God and the power of America we will look forward and pray for that day when the heel of the totalitarian oppressor will be removed and again liberty restored to the fine, brave people of Poland.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I shall always remember a remarkable address made on the floor of this House on Polish Constitution Day several years ago when the now Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] paid great compliment to the liberty-loving people of Poland, and reached a great peroration when he said:

Poland's battle is our battle, and our battle is Poland's battle.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD today on Polish Constitution Day may have the privilege of extending those remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution, which contains her famous bill of rights.

Americans of Polish descent and Poles in all free countries today are celebrating one of the greatest Polish holidays. Not only is this anniversary commemorated by people of Polish extraction, but they are joined by all freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Over a century and a half ago Polish leaders, encouraged and inspired in part

by the American Revolution, proclaimed a new bill of rights for the Polish Nation. Many documents are of great historic significance, but the Polish Constitution is truly one of the world's great documents of freedom. I might say it was the most liberal and the most democratic of its day, and it served as an inspiration to other struggling nations to assert themselves.

The Third of May is to all Poles what the Fourth of July is to all Americans—it is a day among days. Today in the hearts of millions of true Poles, those still behind the iron curtain, and millions of our own Polish-Americans, burns the light of freedom that some day will bring to that heroic nation a new independence.

I need not recall today the glorious history of the Polish people, its record of unsurpassed valor, fearless courage, and unblemished honor. People all over the world recall Poland's magnificent heritage which has served her as a guiding light throughout all the years of her trials and tribulations. We recall that spirit which never yielded its devotion to an ideal.

Through the centuries her great leaders have given their aid and assistance to all countries which were struggling for the right of self-determination. In our own fight for independence, those men of extraordinary capabilities and courage—Pulaski, Sobieski, and Kosciuszko, as well as countless Polish patriots—contributed heavily to our victory. To them and to all the Polish people we owe an unceasing debt of gratitude.

In the present state of affairs, Poland finds herself a victim of Soviet aggression like so many other countries—in spite of the fact that in none of these countries are the Communists in a majority.

Poland was first in the fight against the German aggressor in 1939 and was justly called the inspiration of the world by President Roosevelt. Her heroic stand at that time in the face of aggression by a superior force is an example of courage unparalleled in history. She inspired freedom-loving nations and brought home to them the first realization of the Axis threat to civilization.

By thus engaging Hitler in the early days of the war, Poland prevented a surprise attack on France and England who were unprepared at the time. Had Poland compromised instead of resisting aggression, the whole course of history might have been changed.

As a faithful ally, Poland obtained the promises of the great powers that she would be free and independent, yet today she is under the yoke of another aggressor, which plans eventually to dominate the entire world.

Poland's contribution to the success of the Allied Nations during World War II and her people's struggle to preserve western civilization throughout the years make it incumbent upon us here in America to keep faith with the Polish people, especially at the present time when her long-cherished freedom is once again enslaved.

The Polish people are known as resolute people who can endure a great deal in defense of their liberty. They believe

in the principles of Christianity as opposed to Communist doctrine and practices.

Our ultimate goal, and the ultimate goal of all liberty-loving people, should be the destruction of communism, since it is a doctrine contrary to the spirit of real liberty and one which violates human rights.

Therefore, I again urge that the United States continue every effort to restore Poland to her prewar glory. We are morally obligated to render every possible assistance, both directly and through the United Nations, to help her in her underground struggle to break the chains of totalitarianism which threaten to engulf the Western World.

With the Polish people, I firmly believe that justice and democracy will eventually triumph, but I believe we must furnish concrete proof and assistance to achieve this end as soon as possible.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution. It symbolizes the successful achievement of individual liberty through the untiring efforts of the Polish people.

It is appropriate that this honorable body take cognizance of the situation facing the Polish people in their effort to attain stability and independence as a nation.

History shows Poland as the battleground of Europe, torn between powerful conflicting forces surrounding her, the partitions and the frequent changes in sovereignty over the areas inhabited by Polish peoples, is well known. Polish contributions to art and science are also well known. Poland's aid, through great leaders in the cause of our own independence, has frequently been recognized by the American people. The suffering of the Polish people through the changing conditions of power politics in Europe through the centuries and the persistent courage of her people and her leaders in fighting unflinchingly against overpowering forces seeking to thwart Polish independence have aroused the admiration of mankind.

Not the least in Poland's long history of oppression and tribulations is the history of the Polish people in World War II. The world will long remember the courage of the Polish people in 1939, when they refused to submit to the unrighteous demands of the powerful Nazi war machine. The world will not forget the 1,000,000 military casualties and the 9,000,000 civilian casualties and the devastation of Polish cities and farms as armies surged back and forth across Polish territory in World War II.

The nations of the world owe an obligation to Poland and other small nations like her to make certain that the continual conflict and unrest resulting from the conflicting ambitions of power politics shall cease. A tremendous responsibility rests upon the United Nations organization to guarantee and assure the opportunity to peoples like the Poles to live their lives and enrich their existence without molestation and oppression from any source. The nations of the world owe a duty to the Po-

lish people and others similarly situated under the chaotic conditions existing in the aftermath of the war to guarantee that the people themselves shall have the right to select the kind of government they desire in a free election in which there cannot be any doubt that the results are the expression of the free will of the citizens without coercion or improper influence exerted by outside forces.

As a representative American of Polish descent I await the day when Poland will be free of the Red army bayonets that control Poland today. I await the day when freedom and democracy will be enjoyed by the Polish people as we in America are blessed.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1950, we are again privileged to mark and commemorate Polish Constitution Day. It was on May 3, 1791, that Poland adopted this great document granting far-reaching freedom to her people.

Just as we Americans celebrate Independence Day on July 4 so the people of Poland would jubilantly celebrate today if it were possible for them to do so. But Poland cannot rejoice today. Russia will see that they do not but even the iron heel of Russia cannot prevent the Polish people from a silent and hopeful observance of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of their great day. Let us all hope that in the not too distant future the Polish people will again be free to openly and happily celebrate Constitution Day.

Poland has been the unfortunate battling ground of Europe in many wars. During World War I armies crossed and recrossed her land, destroying homes and fields. I believe that Poland has encountered more misery from wars than any other country in Europe.

During World War II Poland would not yield to Hitler and his barbaric hordes. Poland had the courage to stand and fight the invaders in an effort to preserve her independence. The defense of Warsaw will long be remembered as one of the monumental battles of all times. When she was defeated her brave soldiers did not surrender but fled to other lands and carried on the battle with their allies.

On the slopes of Monte Cassino thousands of these brave men gave their lives and in so doing they saved the lives of many American, British, and French soldiers. They gave their lives but their fathers, mothers, sisters, brothers, friends, and relatives did not reap the fruits of the common victory. Not for them the freedom which their allies are now enjoying—not for them the independence for which they so valiantly fought.

Let us all have faith in the future of Poland. Let us all fervently hope that she will once again proudly stand erect, side by side with the United States, free and independent, as a testimonial to an indomitable courage and unconquerable spirit which has always marked the history and background of that land of hard-fighting, liberty-loving people.

I think we should pause in the midst of our legislative business to silently pray

for the end of all aggressive global wars. If the money which has been spent for wars could be spent for the advancement and benefit of humanity this would be a good world to live in. Poland and the other nations now under the domination of Russia could once again enjoy freedom, liberty, and peace on earth.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a real privilege to stand before this microphone in this House of Representatives, to freely and under no restrictions, address the Members on the occasion of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, adopted in 1791, by the Congress of the Republic of Poland, which was the most liberal, most democratic of its day. Upon rereading it today, one is profoundly moved at its wisdom and magnanimity which assured rights and freedom to the people of Poland.

It was in 1939, which means 11 years ago when Poland and the Polish Nation observed the so-called constitution of May 3 as a free, independent, and sovereign state, on their own soil.

Since that time the Polish Nation has suffered the consequences of war, occupation, and most severe destruction of their homeland. Since that time the great Polish Nation could not observe this memorable and historical day. Yes—11 years have elapsed since Poland went under another era of foreign control and influence.

Here—in this country—we are cognizant of the unparalleled tragedy that the Polish Nation is going through. And today on the day of the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, we express our deep heartfelt sympathy and at the same time convey our sincere sentiments as a brotherly nation.

But, aside of the geographical and political Poland which at the present time experiences results and tactics which is so strange to her—there is another Poland—the spiritual Poland which exists, lives, and grows outside of her natural boundaries. For there is a proverb in the Polish language which in English sounds something like this: "Wherever beats Polish heart, wherever Polish blood flows, there is Poland." Yes, west of the iron curtain, there is another Poland. Just as strong physically, morally, and spiritually, as the one which is known for courage, knighthood, and untiring efforts in their pursuit for freedom, liberty, and independence. We cannot overlook the enormous contribution of the great Polish Nation in their fight to protect the western civilization and the Christian world from being overrun or even annihilated by evil forces all through the history of mankind.

And today this same nation—Poland—observes its one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the constitution of May 3, which, as our own, embodies all the fundamentals of freedom, equality, and independence. And—as stated before—there is another Poland which we might as well call "west of the iron curtain Poland," which is thoroughly democratic and religious, is seeking shelter and refuge from the present "regime" set up after World War II over in Poland.

Many settlements have sprung up all over the world; many new colonies were established where our good friends, Poles, are trying to start living anew. These new settlements are becoming strong outposts of true democracy and Christianity. Many of them came to our shores, where they are enjoying our hospitality—where they are extended all the possible help in their sincere effort to adjust themselves and rehabilitate themselves according to the new conditions and customs existing in this great country of ours.

As long as I am on this subject, mention should be made about the great Polish people, whose gallant sons contributed so much to the independence, growth, and development of these United States of America. The Poles are known to us—well enough. And we know well enough that the present new generation represents just as valuable and desirable element, as the old pioneers and old Polish settlers in this land of plenty.

Today all freedom-loving Poles of two decades unite to pay tribute to their heroes, to the creators of the greatest document of its time, "The constitution of the 3d of May." All those living outside Soviet-dominated Poland assemble in order that they may on this very day express their wishes, their thoughts, their sorrows. Here, on our free and brotherly soil, we consider it an honor and privilege to join our fellow citizens of Polish descent, also all those who came to this country as DP's in their observance of this memorable day, the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the constitution of May 3.

We extend our brotherly hands to all those who so gallantly fought in the last World War, and in all the previous combat encounters in the field of freedom, and on this very day, which is today, Wednesday, May 3, 1950, convey our most sincere hope and most earnest wishes that the great Polish Nation will soon again cherish all the blessing of true freedom, liberty and sovereignty to the fullest extent.

Christianity and democracy are the most precious possessions of mankind, and no nation shall be deprived of these priceless virtues. The Constitution of Poland, often referred to as the Constitution of the 3d of May, was built upon these fundamentals. And we may assure our Polish friends that with their determination, patience, and firm belief in God, as proven by history, they shall regain and achieve complete restoration of Poland which again will take due place in the great family of Christian and democratic nations.

Permit me to stress again that the Poles in Poland of today are forbidden to observe the Third of May Constitution Day. But they are forced to participate in the May 1st day celebrations on the orders from the Kremlin.

Therefore, our commemoration of the Polish national holiday has a twofold purpose. First, to join the Polish people in their observance of the one hundred fifty-ninth anniversary of the Constitution of May the 3d; second, to express our deep sympathy to all those, who by no fault of their own, are unable to join

our ranks, and who are subjugated to a form of government which they do not like, nor approve of.

General characteristics of the Polish people are nearly the same as ours—their love of freedom, recognition of human rights, and understanding of peoples' needs are the same as ours. Our conception of Christianity and democracy—is no different. History tells us that.

So on this day, the one hundred fifty-ninth anniversary of the Constitution of May the 3d of Poland, let us give our Polish friends our most sincere assurance of our moral support to cheer them to encourage them in their continued fight for freedom in full sense of the word. Long live Poland. Let their culture, traditions, and art enrich our new American culture.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the one hundred and fifty-ninth anniversary of the adoption of one of the world's most precious documents, the Polish Constitution.

That document lives today, its spirit and meaning as vigorous as on May 3, 1791, when its birth marked a new advance in European concepts of human liberty and dignity.

It lives not alone in the hearts of those tragically subject to the brutal and foreign tyranny of Soviet Russia, but in the hearts of the millions of countrymen of Kosciusko and Pulaski who helped to build this country in the spirit of the common ideals of the Polish and American Constitutions.

Poland has a tragic history. The insistence of its people on real freedom has always offended those of its larger neighbors who have had good reason to fear a Polish example of vigorous independence on their borders. Poland has again and again suffered invasion and bondage, but the Poles have always thrown off the yoke of their oppressors. I venture to predict that they will do so again.

Only last week, Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of the Marshall plan, said there are two nations now under Communist domination which will lead the ultimate breakaway from the Soviet Union. It is significant that the first name he mentioned was that of Poland.

One of our great objects in the year ahead should be to hasten the day when the democratic spirit of the Polish people can thus express itself without bringing the utter destruction of a great people. May 3 will then become a day of rejoicing as well as of remembering.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

INQUITOUS OPINIONS OF ITALY AND ITALIANS

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on March 13 of this year the Federal Communications Commission began hearings in Los Angeles, Calif., against radio stations KMPC, Los Angeles; WGAR, Cleveland; and WJR, Detroit. I am not concerned about the merits or demerits of this case. I am, however, very much concerned about the type of witness used by the Government.

I would like the RECORD to show that the Federal Communications Commission recently concluded their case against KMPC in Los Angeles and the defense will begin its case on May 15.

In these proceedings the star witness for the Federal Communications Commission was one Clete Roberts, a former employee of Station KMPC, who had been discharged by this station and who admitted he had been fired from every other good job he ever had.

Mr. Speaker, my reason for becoming very interested in this case is that this star witness of the Federal Communications Commission, Clete Roberts, did, while on the witness stand during these hearings on March 17, 1950, and while being cross-examined by Mr. Hugh Fulton, chief trial counsel for Mr. Richards, admit that in a letter he had written he had characterized the people of southern Italy, and I quote, as "charming" but not, in his opinion, "worth a tinker's damn." He further admitted the authorship of a statement that the people of southern Italy were "a lazy and indolent people," that "they wanted"—the United States—"to feed them and think for them" and that these Italians would not "even say thank you for the favors they had received from our country."

When Mr. Fulton asked this man Roberts if he intended to include every clergyman, every farmer, every artisan or mechanic, banker, lawyer, or statesman in southern Italy as not being worth a tinker's damn, or whether these expressions were just unfortunate ones which this man Roberts had written in a letter, this same star witness, Roberts, said several times with great positiveness that such statements were true and that he still stood behind them.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to visit the southern part of Italy in the fall of 1949 and I also visited the birthplace of my mother and my father who were born about 100 miles from Naples. The people of southern Italy may not possess all the worldly goods we enjoy in this country, and that is admitted—but they are a hard-working, honest, and God-fearing people. Like every Member of this House, I am proud of my ancestry.

During my visit to the southern part of Italy, where my people came from, I made it my business to inquire as to whether they had heard of the Marshall plan or if they had received any benefits from it—either directly or indirectly. Their answer to me was that they had never heard of our Marshall plan. In other words, Mr. Speaker, these southern Italians have been, and are, a race of people who earned what they have by the sweat of their brow. The reason that so many Italian immigrants migrated to the United States was because they were ambitious, hard-working, and wanted to become a part of this land of opportunity. I think that it is an accepted fact that the Italian-Americans in the United States have played a great part in building this great country of ours.

With all the above in mind it is understandable, therefore, why I deeply resent the remarks of such a man as

this individual, Clete Roberts. In what manner, shape, or form can he possibly look upon himself as a 100-percent American? In my judgment he has no understanding at all of what begins to constitute good Americanism. When a witness like this man Roberts places all the Italians of southern Italy in one class as not being worth "a tinker's damn," he forfeits any support whatsoever from any real Americans.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and with very deliberate and emphatic feeling, I want it understood that it is more than amazing to me that a man of this type, who expresses under oath such opinions as have been placed in this RECORD today, could possibly be advanced and supported by any agency of our Government as a credible witness. I respectfully draw the attention of all Members of the House to my remarks on this one point because I intend to explore this matter a great deal further, so that the Federal Communications Commission will, in the future, take a great deal more care in investigating the credibility and Americanism of a witness whom it has supported, and apparently continues to support, as one of its star performers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a part of this record a translation of an editorial from the Italian-American paper in Los Angeles, Calif., dated March 24, 1950:

[From L'Italo-Americano, Los Angeles, Calif., of March 24, 1950]

LANTERN

(Full text translated from the Italian of column by Clete Baroni, editor and publisher)

Iniquitous opinions of Italy and of the Italians—ever since I sailed the ocean to come into a land discovered by an Italian and called by the name of another Italian—I have heard and read so many opinions that now I succeed somewhat not only to control my nerves but also to forgive in a Christian manner those, who through their ignorance or through their inborn prejudice, express these opinions.

I am referring to forgiveness not to gain a seat in heaven or to soften the pious women, but because, distance having been abolished by the airplane, today, for each stupid, evil defamer of Italy, there are thousands and thousands of persons who instead exalt Italy for her beauties and for her glory and for the superb qualities of her people. So, I was not impressed when I learned during the course of instruction that the Federal Communications Commission is conducting among us in reference to the radio stations KMPC, WJR, and WGAR, of a letter which has been carried here and there and written years ago by the accusing Clete Roberts, to his exboss Mr. G. A. Richards. This illustrious gentleman, who went to Italy immediately after the surrender, expresses himself of the Italians thusly: "The people of southern Italy, although charming, are not, in my opinion, worth a tinker's damn. They are lazy, indolent, they want us to feed them, think of them, and they won't even say 'thank you' for the favors."

Without any differentiation and not realizing that the Italians have gone from suffering to suffering—moral suffering and unmentionable physical suffering—Roberts so expresses himself of the Italians, from the donkey land down, as though those from Rome and north were not also Italians. Time does not seem to have changed this opinion of his when at the request of At-

torney Hugh Fulton if he wished to modify what he had written word for word he answered: "No, I will stand behind that letter."

We do not care so much that he changes it, I repeat. It isn't what he thinks of us which may lift or lower us in the opinion of the same people of the world.

One item I would like to bring forth is that this gentleman evidently has open prejudices for a race. He is the same who testified against his exboss, accusing that he, his exboss, tried to influence him into the transmission of telegraphic news to the radio in reference to the Jews and certain political groups.

From what pulpit does the preaching come. I will say and you will say.

I have said above that for each defamer, there are thousands and thousands of persons ready to exalt Italy. Here for example is what the famous American reporter, Maren Schwarzschild, writes of Italy after a tour from one end to the other: "At the end of my Italian experience, I can only tell you this: I adore Italy and her people rich of so many natural talents, and I suggest to whosoever has not visited her to do the impossible to have it become a reality the dream of knowing her as soon as possible. Every minute of stay in Italy will be a discovery and a joy."

I also want to make a part of this RECORD the exact language this witness Roberts used in a letter he wrote to his former employer, in which he attacks the people of southern Italy:

MY DEAR MR. RICHARDS: Periodically, it seems, I feel inclined to drop you a short note and let you know what's happened to me and what I've witnessed in my wanderings abroad.

I've been in Italy and central Europe as well as the Middle East for the past 6 months. I've been pretty fortunate in my assignments, having seen the surrender in northern Italy and the break-up in Germany proper. I've had some contacts with our "ally" the Russians, and I've been thinking quite a bit about this unholy mess over here. And, believe me, Dick, it is a mess. Most discouraging it is, to witness the end-product of all our labors, all our fighting. To me, the muddled picture here is most discouraging. I, personally, have come to feel rather keenly about this war and what it has cost in terms of human life and human suffering. I am inclined to believe that for all we, and by "we" I mean America, have given, we should have some guarantee of peace in return. But, I'm damned if I can see any guaranty of anything but further uncertainty over here for many years to come.

There is, I believe, some hope for Italy providing the industrialists of the north can get the wheels turning in their factories again. There is a heavy Communist flavor all through northern Italy. The partisans are, as you know, dominated by the Communist party. They often display the hammer and sickle red flag alongside the Italian flag. However, I believe some intelligent handling of the economic situation in northern Italy would soon make them forget about Russia, Communism, and everything that goes with it. All the people of Italy want, like people everywhere in this world, is a job, a home and food on the table. Incidentally, I was really impressed by the northern Italians. They are hard working, industrious, intelligent. Their industry, by the way, is not too badly smashed. Our bombing during the strategic phase of the air battle was excellent. We smashed only the key plants. We did not level everything in sight. As a result, I think northern Italy has a fairly good chance of getting back on its industrial feet. At least it can be done faster than anyone previously thought possible. The people of southern

Italy, although charming, are not, in my opinion, worth a tinker's damn. They are lazy, indolent, they want us to feed them, think for them. And they won't even say "thank you" for the favors. The fact that Italy's new prime minister, Ferruccio Parri, came from Milan, in the north, is indication enough as to which way the wind is blowing as far as political influence in this country is concerned.

Please give my kindest personal regards to Mrs. Richards and to your charming daughter.

Sincerely,

CLETE ROBERTS.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAURIELLO. I yield.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I wish to join with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TAURIELLO] for his condemnation of this very un-American and this very intolerant attitude on the part of the man who is being used by an agency of our Government. It happens that in my district there are tens of thousands of people whose ancestors migrated from southern Italy. They are the people who are the brawn and brain that helped build our great democracy. They built the railroads across the country and helped build the buildings, and have distinguished themselves in every walk of life. I join with the gentleman in condemning this very intolerant attitude on the part of this Mr. Roberts.

Mr. TAURIELLO. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

May I interpose at this point that the ancestors, the mothers and fathers of every Member of the House of Representatives who is of Italian extraction migrated to the United States from the southern part of Italy. They all came within a radius of 100 or 150 miles of where my people came from. Certainly that does not detract from the type of people who came from southern Italy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Mr. DOUGHTON.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include certain printed matter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and in the first to include a resolution and in the second certain remarks.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. POULSON) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the Chamber of Commerce of Naugatuck, Conn., and a resolution from the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. REES) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. DELANEY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness;

To Mr. STIGLER, until May 9, 1950, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson;

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Pansy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor;

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Stella Ayner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 277. An act to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 621. An act for the relief of Horace J. Fenton;

S. 2590. An act to amend section 3526 of the Revised Statutes relating to coinage of subsidiary silver coins;

S. 2853. An act to authorize the acceptance of foreign decorations for participation in the Berlin airlift;

S. 2874. An act to amend titles 18 and 28, United States Code, with respect to the time of reporting to Congress rules of procedure adopted by the Supreme Court for criminal, civil, and admiralty cases and the time of their taking effect;

S. 3117. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels," approved May 23, 1930, as amended (39 U. S. C. 246c); and

S. 3255. An act to amend section 415 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to extend the effective date of that section to December 31, 1950, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 597. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine,

and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States;

H. R. 1024. An act for the relief of Jacob Brown;

H. R. 1026. An act for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of I. D. Cosson, a minor;

H. R. 3536. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nora Johnson;

H. R. 4164. An act for the relief of Elmer Pippin and Mrs. Nancy Pippin and the legal guardian of Norman Otis Pippin, a minor;

H. R. 4270. An act for the relief of Stella Ayner; and

H. R. 6051. An act for the relief of Maud E. Raymond.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1428. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$3,000,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 582), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of Committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7695. A bill to provide a 5-day week for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, and the White House Police force; with amendment (Rept. No. 2001). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 8221. A bill to encourage the conservation and development of the mineral resources of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2002). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7155. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2003). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRISON: Committee of conference. H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the Hatch Act (Rept. No. 2004). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 469. An act for the relief of

Cathryn A. Glesener; without amendment (Rept. No. 1977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BENTON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2229. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster; Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster; William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders; and John S. Bantham, station examiner, at Albany, N. Y.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2535. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall; with amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Goakes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3535. A bill for the relief of William A. Cross; without amendment (Rept. No. 1981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4140. A bill for the relief of the Great American Indemnity Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4364. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clarence F. Moore; John Robert Lusk 3d; J. R. Lusk, Sr.; Gertrude Elizabeth Lusk; Mrs. Willie Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle; with amendment (Rept. No. 1983). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4803. A bill for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1984). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4960. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney; with amendment (Rept. No. 1985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5252. A bill for the relief of W. M. Tindal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5799. A bill for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6416. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Rocke; without amendment (Rept. No. 1988). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6644. A bill for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds; without amendment (Rept. No. 1989). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7991. A bill for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2225. A bill for the relief of William B. Buol; with amendment (Rept. No. 1991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertrude Mulders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3805. A bill for the relief of Yuk Onn Won; with amendment (Rept. No. 1993). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5221. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1994). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5947. A bill for the relief of Alfio Batelli; without amendment (Rept. No. 1995). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6066. A bill for the relief of Cheng Sick Yuen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1996). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7315. A bill for the relief of Daijiro Yoshida; without amendment (Rept. No. 1997). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7564. A bill for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries; with amendment (Rept. No. 1998). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 65. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1999). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7966. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806; without amendment (Rept. No. 2000). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8338. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 8339. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 8340. A bill to extend the rights and responsibilities of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8341. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the State of North Dakota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HUBER (by request):

H. R. 8342. A bill to provide automobiles for blind veterans of World War II who are entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8343. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River and to authorize the construction of certain public works on that river for power and other purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 8344. A bill to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 8345. A bill to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to recordable contracts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 8346. A bill to provide for the repeal of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 8347. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, relating to insurance of accounts in Federal savings and loan associations, so as to increase the maximum insurable account from \$5,000 to \$10,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 8348. A bill to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 8349. A bill to authorize deductions from the wages of seamen for payment into employee welfare funds; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 8350. A bill to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8351. A bill to strengthen the common defense by providing for continuation and expansion of Western Hemisphere production of abaca by the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 8352. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 8353. A bill to amend Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 8354. A bill to require the execution of a loyalty affidavit by every officer or employee in or under the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 8355. A bill to amend sections 174, 200, 200a, and 200b of title 21, United States Code; section 2557 (b), title 26, United States Code; and section 2596, title 26, United States Code, to provide minimum and maximum penalties upon conviction of violation of the act of May 26, 1922, as amended; the act of December 17, 1914, as amended; and the act of August 2, 1937, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8356. A bill authorizing the Missouri River Basin agricultural program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8357. A bill to provide for an agricultural program in the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8358. A bill to prohibit the purchase by the Federal Government of prison-made goods which compete with goods made by free labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 8359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carolyn W. Cheatham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 8360. A bill for the relief of Victor Z. Bergere and Greta S. Bergere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 8361. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Murai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8362. A bill for the relief of Bernard Croft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 8363. A bill for the relief of Harry Chilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Richard Raines, bishop of the Methodist Church, Indianapolis, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, without whose knowledge not a sparrow falleth, whose purposes cannot be frustrated, Thou hast committed to us the swift and solemn trust of life and set us amid circumstances so perplexing and uncertain that we know not what a day may bring forth. We do know that the hour for serving Thee is always present. Awaken us to the claims and guidance of Thy holy will. Grant us in all our doubts and uncertainties the good sense to ask what Thou wouldst have us to do, that the spirit of wisdom might save us from all false choice.

Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet must go, and the humblest work will shine and the rough places be made plain. Lift us above unrighteous anger and vengeance and suspicion into faith and hope and charity by a simple and steadfast reliance on Thy holy will.

We pray in the name of Thy blessed Son. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFarland, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 3, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 3, 1950, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 455) authorizing the designation of American Student Nurse Days, 1950, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.